COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SCC
9156

8

Edwar Giles pret 6s 3d

Sum e libris Mosi Pyr: empt.
Glocestr. - pret - 6s - 3d.

Presented to the Theological
Seminary at Princeton N. J.
By the Rev. G Bourne.

Vindiciæ Evangelicæ

OR

The Myſtery of the Goſpell

VINDICATED,

AND

SOCINIANISME *Examined*,

In the Conſideration, and Confutation of

A Catechiſme, called *A Scripture Catechiſme*,
Written by J. BIDDLE *M. A.*

And the Catechiſme of *Valentinus Smalcius*, commonly called the *Racovian Catechiſme.*

WITH

The Vindication of the Teſtimonies of Scripture, concerning the Deity and Satisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt, from the Perverſe Expoſitions, and Interpretations of them, by *Hugo Grotius* in his Annotations on the BIBLE.

Alſo an Appendix, in Vindication of ſome things formerly written about the Death of Chriſt, & the fruits thereof, from the Animadverſions of Mr *R. B.*

By JOHN OWEN D. D. A Servant of *Jeſus Chriſt* in the Work of the Goſpell.

Μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτα λέγοντι ἁπλῶς πιστεύσῃς, ἐὰν τῷ ἀποδείξιν τῆς κηρυσσομένης ἀπὸ θείων μὴ λάβῃς χαρῶν. *Cyril. Hieroſ. Catech. 4.*

OXFORD,
Printed by *Leon. Lichfield* Printer to the Univerſity,
for *Tho. Robinſon.* 1655.

TO THE

RIGHT HONOVRABLE

THE COUNCEL OF

STATE

TO HIS

HIGHNESSE.

The Ensuing Vindication of the Glory and Doctrine of the GREAT GOD & Our Saviour JESUS CHRIST, Written upon Their Command, Is Humbly Dedicated,

BY

Its Unworthy Author

J. O.

To the Right Worſhipfull, His Reverend, Learned, and Worthy Friends, and Brethren, the Heads, and Governours of the Colledges *and* Halls, *with all other Students in Divinity, or of the Truth which is after Godlineſſe, in the Famous Univerſity of* OXFORD.

IF This *Second* Addreſſe unto *you* in this Kind, whereunto I am encouraged by your *faire* and *candid* Reception of my *Former*, I deſire you would be pleaſed to take the *enſuing* Account. It is now (as I remember) about a *yeare agoe*, ſince one Mr *Biddle*, (formerly a *Maſter* of *Arts* of this Univerſity, by which *Title* he ſtill ownes himſelfe) *Publiſhed two Little Catechiſmes*, (as he calls them) wherein under ſundry *ſpecious* Pleas and Pretences, (which you will find *diſcuſſed* in the enſuing Treatiſe) he endeavours to inſinuate *ſubtilly* into the minds of *unſtable* and *unlearned men*, the whole ſubſtance of the *Socinian* Religion. The man is a *Perſon*, whom (to my knowledge) I never *ſaw*, nor have been at all *curious* to enquire after the place of his habitation, or *courſe* of his Life. His oppoſition ſome years ſince, to the *Deity of the Holy Ghoſt*, and *now* to that of the *Father and Sonne* alſo, is all that he is *known* to me by. It is not with his *Perſon* that I have any *conteſt*: he *ſtands* or *falls* to his own Maſter. His Arguments againſt the Deity of the *Holy Ghoſt*, were ſomewhile ſince anſwered by *Clopenburgh*, then *Profeſſor* of Divinity at *Franeker* in *Frieſland*, ſince at *reſt* in the Lord; and (as I have heard) by *one* in *Engliſh*. His *Catechiſmes* alſo are gone

over the Seas, whereof *farther* mention must afterwards be made. At their first Publishing, complaint being given in by some *worthy* Persons to the *Honourable Councell* against them, as *abusive* to the *Majesty* and *Authority* of the Word of God, and *destructive* to many important Truths of the Gospell, (which was done without any *knowledge* of mine) They were pleased to *send for me*, and to *require* of me the performance of that Work, which is here *presented* unto you. Being *surprized* with their *request*, I laboured to excuse my selfe to the *utmost*, on the account of my *many employments* in the University and elsewhere, with other Reasons of the like *nature*, which to my thoughts did then *occurre*. Not prevailing with them, they *persisting in their Command*, I looked on it as a *call* from God to *plead* for his *violated* Truth, which by his *Assistance*, and according as I had *Opportunity*, I was in generall allway resolved to doe. Having *indeed*, but newly taken off my *hand* from the *Plough* of a peculiar Controversy, about the *Perseverance of the Saints*, in the following whereof I was somewhat *tired*, the *Entrance* into the Work was *irkesome* and *burthensome* unto me: After some progresse made, finding the searching *into*, and discussing of the *important Truths* opposed, of very good *use* to my *selfe*, I have been carried through the whole (according as I could break off my *dayly pressing occasions* to attend unto it) with much *Cheerfulnesse*, and Alacrity of mind. And this was the Reason, why, finding M. *B.* came short of giving a *faire occasion* to the *full vindication* of many heads of Religion by him oppugned, I have called in to his *Assistance* and *Society* one of his great Masters, namely *Valentinus Smalcius*, and his *Catechisme* (commonly called the *Racovian*) with the *Exposi-*

Expositions of the places of Scripture *Contended about* by the Learned *Grotius*, as also on severall occasions, the *Arguments* and *Answers* of most of the chiefe *propugners* of M. *B's* Religion. Now besides your *Interest* in the *Truths* pleaded for, there are other *Considerations* also, inducing me to a *perswasion*, that this endeavour of mine will not be unacceptable unto you. M. *B's Catechisme* (as I said) being carried *over*, and dispersed in sundry places of the *United Provinces*, the Professors of their *Academies*, (who have all generally Learned the *English Tongue*, to enable them for the Understanding of the *Treatises of Divinity* in all kinds writtē therein, which they begin to make use of, to *the purpose*) cry out against thē, & *professedly* undertake the refutation thereof. Now certainly it cannot be for our *Advantage* in poynt of *repute* amongst them; that they (who are yet glad of the Occasion) should be enforced to undertake the Confutation of a Book, written by *one* who *stiles* himselfe a *Master of Arts of this Universitie*, (which they also take notice of) wherein they are so *little concerned*; the poyson of it being *shut* up from their People, under the *safe custody* of an unknown Tongue. * *Nicolaus Arnoldus*, the Professor of *Divinity* at *Franeker*, gives an *account* of this *Book*, as the most *subtile* insinuation of the *Socinian Religion*, that ever was attempted, and Promises a *Confutation* of it.

* *Prodiit hoc anno in Anglia, Auctore* Johanne Bidello, *Artium Magistro, pneumatomacho, duplex Catechesis Scripturaria, Anglico idiomate typis evulgata, quâ sub nomine Religionis Christianæ purum putum Socinianismum, orbi Christiano obtrudere satagit. Quanquam autem non videatur velle Socinianus haberi; attamen cujus sit ingenii, sub finem libelli prodit, cum commendat librum cui Titulus,* The Life of that incomparable Man, *Faustus Socinus Senensis, phrasin Scripturæ ad dogmata mere Sociniana ita detorsit, ut nemo ante eum hæresin istam tam fraudulenter instillarit: Larvam illi detrahere post dies caniculares, cum Deo est animus.* Nicol. Arnold. Præf. ad Lector.

Maresius

Necessarium est hoc tristi tempore, quo Sociniana pestis, quam haud immerito dixeris omnis impietatis ἀκρόπολιν, videtur nunc in vicina Anglia sedem sibi Metropolitanam fixisse, nisi quod isthic facile admittat & bella eruenta, & Judicia capitalia severissima, sub quorum umbone crevit.

Maresius Professor at *Groning*, a man well known by his *Works* published, goes farther; and on the account of these *Catechismes*, Charges the *whole Nation*, and the *Governours* of it, with *Socinianisme*, and (according to the *manner* of the Man) raises a *fearfull out-cry*, affirming, that that *Heresy* hath fixed its *Metropolitical seat* here in *England*, & is here openly *professed*, is the *head* Sect in the *Nation*, *displaying openly the Banners of its iniquity*; all which he confirmes by *instancing* in this Book of a *Master of Arts of the University of Oxford*. Of his *rashnesse* in *censuring*, his extreame *ignorance* of the state of Affaires here amongst us, which yet he undertakes to *relate*, judge, and condemn, I have given him an account in a *private* Letter to himselfe.

Nam inter varias Hæreses, quibus felix illa quondam insula & Orthodoxiæ tenacissima hodie conspurcatur, tantum eminet Socinianismus, quantum lenta solent inter viburna Cupressi: nec enim amplius ibi horrenda sua mysteria mussitat in angulis, sed sub dio explicat omnia vexilla suæ iniquitatis: non loquor incomperta, Benevole Lector: Modo enim ex Anglia allatus est Anglica lingua conscriptus Catechismus duplex, Major & Minor, Londini publice excusus, hoc Anno 1654. apud Jac Coterell, *&* Rich. Moone, *&c. Authore* Johanne Bidello Magistro Artium Oxonienſi. &c. Sam Mares. Hyd. Socin. Refut. Tom. 2. Præfat. ad Lect.

Certainly, though we *deserved* to have these *reproaches* cast upon us, yet of all men in the World, *those* who live under the *Protection*, and upon the allowance of the *United Provinces*, are most *unmeet* to mannage them: Their *incompetency* in sundry respects for this *service* is known to all. However it cannot be denied, but that even on *this account*, (that it may appeare, that we are *as* free from the guilt of the *calumnious insinuations* of *Maresius*, so in no need of the *assistance* of *Arnoldus*, for the Confutation of any *one* arising among our selves, *speaking perverse things to draw Disciples after him*,) an Answer from *some* in this place unto those

thoſe *Catechiſmes*, was *ſufficiently* neceſſary. That it is by Providence fallen upon the *hand* of one, more *unmeet* then *many* others in this place, for the *performance* of this Work and *Duty*, I doubt not but you will be *contented* withall; and am *bold* to hope, that neither the *Truth*, nor your *own eſteeme*, will too much *ſuffer*, by my engagement herein. Yea, give me leave to ſpeak it, I have aſſumed the *confidence*, to aime at the *handling* of the whole *Body of the Socinian Religion*, in ſuch a *way* and manner, as that thoſe who are *moſt knowing*, and exerciſed in theſe *Controverſies*, may find that, which they will not *altogether deſpiſe*, and *younger* Students that, whereby they may *profit*. To this End I have added the *Racovian Catechiſme*, (as I ſaid before) to M. *B's*: which as I was *urged* to doe by many worthy Perſons in this *Univerſity*, ſo I was no way *diſcouraged* in the publiſhing of my *Anſwer* thereunto, by the view *I* took of *Arnoldus* his diſcourſe to the ſame purpoſe, and that for *ſuch Reaſons*, as *I* ſhall not expreſſe, but leave the whole to the judgement of the Reader.

From *thence*, whence in the *thoughts* of *Some*, *I* am moſt *likely* to ſuffer, as to my own *Reſolves*, *I* am moſt ſecure. It is in medling with *Grotius* his *Annotations*, and calling into *queſtion* what hath been delivered by ſuch a *Gyant* in al kinds of *Literature*. Since my *engagement* in this Buſineſſe, & when I had well nigh finiſhed the *Vindication* of the Texts of Scripture *commonly* pleaded, for the Demonſtration of the *Deity* of Chriſt, from the Exceptions put into their *Teſtimonies*, by the *Racovian Catechiſme*, I had the ſight of Dr *H's* Apology for him, in his Vindication of his *Diſſertations* about *Epiſcopacy*, from my occaſionall *Animadverſions*, publiſhed in the Preface of my Book of the *Perſeve-*

rance of the *Saints*. Of that whole *Treatise* I shall elsewhere give an account. My Defensative as to my dealing with *Grotius* his *Annotations*, is suited to what the *Doctor* pleads in his *behalfe*, which occasions this *mention* thereof.

This very Pious, Learned, Judicious Man (he tells us) *hath fallen under some harsh censures of late, especially upon the account of Socinianisme and Popery.* That is, not as though he would *Reconcile* those *Extreames*, but being in *Doctrinalls* a *Socinian*, he yet closed in many things with the *Roman* interest: as I no way doubt, but Thousands of the same *perswasion* with the *Socinians*, as to the *Person* and *Offices* of Christ, do live in the outward Communion of that *Church* (as they call it) to this day; of which *suppose all I* am not without *considerable* grounds, and eminent instances for its Confirmation. This (*I* say) is *their* charge upon him. For his being a *Socinian* (he tells us) *Three things are made use of, to beget a jealousy in the minds of men of his inclinations that way.* 1. *Some parcells of a Letter of his to* Crellius, 2. *Some Relations of what passed from him at his Death.* 3. *Some passages in his Annotations:* It is this Last alone wherein *I* am concerned. And what *I* have to speak to *them*, *I* desire may be *measured* and Weighed by what *I* doe premise. It is not that *I* do entertaine in my *selfe* any hard thoughts, or that *I* would beget in others any evill *surmises* of the *Eternall condition* of that man, that *I speake* what *I* do. What *am I, that I should judge another mans Servant?* He is *fallen* to his own *Master*. I am very slow to judge of mens Acceptation with God, by the *Apprehension* of their Understandings. This only *I* know, that be *men* of what *Religion* soever, that is *professed* in the World, if they are *Drunkards, Proud, Boasters, &c. Hypocrites,*

Hypocrites, haters of good men, persecutors and revilers of them, yea if they be not *regenerate* and *borne of God*, united to the head *Christ Jesus*, by the same *spirit* that is in him, they shall never see God.

But for the Passages in his *Annotations*, the substance of the *Doctors plea* is; that the *passages intimated are in his Posthuma, that he intended not to publish them, that they might be of things he observed, but thought farther to consider: and an instance is given in that of Col.* 1. 16. which he interprets, contrary to what he urged it for, *Joh.* 1. 1, 2, 3. But granting what is *affirmed* as to matter of *fact*, about his *Collections*; (though the Preface to the last part of his *Annotations* will not allow it to be true) I must needs abide in my dissatisfaction as to these *Annotations*, & of my resolves in these *Thoughts* give the *Doctor* this account. Of the *Socinian* Religion there are *two* main Parts; the first is *Photinianisme*, the latter *Pelagianisme*: The first *concerning* the *Person*, the other the *Grace* of Christ. Let us take an Eminent instance out of either of these heads: out of the First, their denying *Christ* to be *God by Nature*. Out of the *Latter*, their *denyall* of his *Satisfaction*.

Jam vero sciendum est, multo quidem citius, quam nunc demum temporis eam resumi, absolviq; potuisse, et quo minus id jampridem factum sit, per eum non stetisse virum, cujus fideli curæ opus integrum ab Authore ipso primum creditum fuit & sedulo commendatum. Pramon. ad Lect.

For the First, *I* must needs tell the *Apologist*, that of all the Texts of the *New* Testament and *Old*, whereby the *Deity* of *Christ* is usually Confirmed, and where it is evidently testified unto, He hath not left any more then *one* (that I have observed) if one, speaking any thing *clearly* to that purpose. *I* say, if *one*, for that he speaks not *home* to the business in *hand* on *Joh.* 1: *I* shall elsewhere give an Account; perhaps some *one* or *two* more may be *interpreted* according to the *Analogy* of that. *I* speak not of his *Annotations* on the *Epistles*, but on the whole Bible *throughout*, whererein

his *Expositions* given, do for the most part fall in with those of the *Socinians*, & oftentimes *consist* in the very words of *Socinus* and *Smalcius*, and alway do the *same* things with them, as to any *notice* of the *Deity* of Christ in them. So that *I* marvell the *Learned Doctor* should *fixe* upon *one particular* instance, as though that *one place* alone were *corrupted* by him, when there is not *one* (or but *one*) that is not *wrested*, *perverted*, and *corrupted* to the same purpose. For the full conviction of the Truth hereof, I refer the Reader to the ensuing Considerations of his Interpretatiõs of the places themselves. The condition of these *famous Annotations*, as to the *Satisfaction* of Christ, is the same: not *one* Text of the *whole Scripture*, wherein *Testimony* is given to that *sacred Truth*, which is not Wrested to *another* sence, or at least the Doctrine *in it* concealed, and *obscured* by them. I do not speak this with the *least* intention to *cast* upon him the *reproach* of a *Socinian:* I judge not his *Person*; his Books are Published to be considered and judged. *Erasmus* I know made way for him, in most of his *Expositions* about the Deity of Christ: but what *repute* he hath thereby *obtained* among all that honour the *Eternall Godhead* of the Son of God, let *Bellarmine* on the one hand, and *Beza* on the other, evince. And as I will by no *meanes* maintaine or urge against *Grotius* any of the miscarriages in *Religion*, which the *Answerer* of my *Animadversions* undertakes to vindicate him from; nor do I *desire* to *Fight* with the *dust* and *Ashes* of men; yet what I have said, *is*, if not *necessary* to *return* to the *Apologist*, yet of tendency, I hope, to the Satisfaction of others, who may enquire after the Reason of my calling the *Annotations* of the Learned Man to an account in this discourse. Shall any one take *liberty* to pluck down the

pillars

Pillars of our Faith, and weaken the *Grounds* of our *assurance*, concerning the *Person* and *Grace* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall not we have the *boldnesse* to call him to an *account* for so *sacrilegious* an attempt; with those then, who *Love* the Lord Christ in *sincerity*, *I* expect no *blame* or *reproach* for what *I* have endeavoured in this kind; yea that my *good will* shall find *acceptance* with them, especially if it shall occasion any of *greater leasure* and Abilites farther, and professedly to remarke more of the *Corruptions* of those *Annotations*, *I* have good ground of Expectation. The truth is, notwithstanding their *pompous* shew and *appearance* (few of his Quotations, which was the * manner of the man, being at all to his purpose) It will be found no difficult matter to discusse his *Assertions*, and Dissipate his Conjectures.

* Grotius in lib. 5. de veritat. Relig: Christian. in notis R. Sel. Aben Ezra & Onkelos adducit: *sed alienis oculis hic vidit, aut alienâ fide retulit (forte authoribus illis aut non intellectis, aut propter occupationes non inspectis) aut animositati & authoritati suæ in citandis authoribus, & referendis dictis aut factis, ut ipsi hoc usui veniebat, nimium in scriptis Theologicis indulserit.* Voet. disput. de Advent. Messi.

For his being a Papist, *I* have not much to say; let his Epistles (published by his Friends) written to *Dyonysius Petavius* the *Jesuite*, be perused, and you will see the *Character* which of Himselfe he gives: As also what in *sundry writings* he ascribes to the *Pope*.

Reverende Domine, sæpe tibi molestus esse cogor -- sumpsi hanc ultimam operam, mea antehac dicta & famam queq; a ministris allatratam tuendi, in eo scripto si quid est, aut Catholicis sententiis discongruens, aut cæteroqui a veritate alienum, de eo abs te viro Eruditissimo &c. cujus judicium plurimi facio moneri percupio. Epist Grot. ad Dyonys. Pelat. Epist. 204.

What *I* have performed through the *good hand of God*, in the *whole*, is humbly submitted to your *Judgement*. You know (all of you) with what *weight* of *businesse* and *Employment I* am *pressed*; what is the *constant work* that in this place is *incumbent* on me, how *many* & *how urgent* my *avocations* are; the *consideration*

whereof, cannot but prevaile for a *pardon* of that want of *exactneſſe*, which perhaps in ſundry Particulars will appeare unto you. With thoſe who are neither *willing* nor *able* to doe any thing in this *kind* themſelves, and yet make it their buſineſſe to *deſpiſe* what is done by others, *I* ſhall very little trouble my ſelfe. That which ſeems in *relation* hereunto, to call for an *Apology*, is, my *Engagement* into this Work, wherein *I* was not particularly *concerned*, ſuffering in the *mean time* ſome *Treatiſes* againſt me to lye *Unanſwered*. D. *Hammonds* Anſwer to my *Animadverſions* on his *Diſſertations* about *Epiſcopacy*; Mr *Baxter's* Objections againſt ſomewhat Written *about the Death of Chriſt*; and a Book of one Mr *Horne* againſt my *Treatiſe* about *Univerſall Redemption*, are all the *inſtances* that *I* know of, which in this kind may be *given*. To all that candidly take notice of theſe things, my defence is at hand. *I* do not know that *I* am more obliged to Anſwer a Treatiſe written *againſt my ſelfe*, then any other written againſt the *Truth*, though *I* am not particularly *named*, or oppoſed therein. Nor do *I* intend to put any ſuch *Law of diſquietneſſe* upon my Spirit, as to think my *ſelfe bound* to reply to every thing that is *written* againſt me, whether the *matter* and *ſubject* of it be worth the publick ventilation, or no. It is neither Name, nor Repute, that *I eye* in theſe Conteſts; ſo the *Truth* be *ſafe*, I can be well content to ſuffer. Beſides, this preſent taske was not *voluntarily* undertaken by me, it was (as I have already given account) *Impoſed* on me by ſuch an *Authority*, as I could not wave. For M. *Hornes* Book, I ſuppoſe you are not acquainted with it; that alone was extant before my laſt engagement; could I have met with any one unintereſted *Perſon*, that

that would have ſaid it deſerved a Reply, it had not have laid ſo long Unanſwered: In the mean time *I* cannot but rejoyce, that *ſome like minded* with him, cannot impute my ſilence to the weakneſſe of the Cauſe I mannaged, but to my *incompetency* for the work of Maintaining it. To Mr *Baxter*, as *far as I am concerned*, I have made a *Returne* in the cloſe of this *Treatiſe*: wherein I ſuppoſe I have put an *End* to that *Controverſy*. Dr *Hammonds Defenſative* came forth much about the *time*, that *halfe* this Treatiſe was *finiſhed*: and being about a matter of ſo *mean Concernment*, in compariſon of thoſe *weighty* Truths of the Goſpell, which *I* was engaged in the defence of, *I* durſt not deſert my *Station*, to turne aſide thereto. On the *curſory view I* have taken of it, *I* look upon what is of *reall difference* between that *Learned Perſon* and my ſelfe, to be a matter of eaſy diſpatch. His *Leaves* are much more *ſoft* and *gentle*, then thoſe of *Socinus*, *Smalcius*, *Crellius*, and *Schlichtingius*. If the Lord in his Goodneſſe be pleaſed to give me a little *Reſpite* and *Leiſure*, I ſhall give a farther account of the whole *difference* between the *Learned Doctor* and *Me*, in ſuch a way of Proceſſe, as may be expected from ſo ſlow and dull a Perſon as I am; in the mean time, I wiſh him a *better cauſe* to *mannage*, then that wherein *againſt me* he is engaged, and better *principles* to Mannage a *Good Cauſe on*, then ſome of thoſe in his *Treatiſe of Schiſme*, and ſome others; *faile* he not in *theſe*, his *Abilities* and *Diligence* will ſtand him in very *Good ſtead*. I ſhall not trouble you with things which I have *advantages* other waies to *impart* my Thoughts *concerning*; only crave that you would be *pleaſed candidly* to accept of this Teſtimony of my *Re-*

Mr *J. G.*

ſpects

ſpects to You; and ſeeing no *other* things are in the enſuing Treatiſe pleaded for, but ſuch as are *Univerſally* owned amongſt *You*, that according to your *ſeverall Degrees*, you would take it into your *Patronage* or *uſe*; affording him in his daily Labours the benefit of your Prayers, at the *Throne* of Grace, who is,

Your Unworthy Fellow Labourer

OXON.
Ch.Ch.Coll.
April. 1.

JOHN OWEN.

To

To those that Labour in the Word and Doctrine, in these Nations of England, Scotland, *and* Ireland, *with all that call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord:*

JOHN OWEN *wisheth Grace and Peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Iesus Christ.*

THat so meane a person, *as I am*, should presume in this *publick manner*, to make Addres to all those comprised in the *Title* of this *Epistle*; I desire it may be *ascribed* to the *business* I come about, and the *message* that I bring. It is about your great *Interest* and Concernment, your whol *portion*, & inheritance, your *all*, that I am to deal with you. If he who *passes* by his neighbour's *house*, seeing a *Thief* breaking up it's *foundations*, or setting *fire* to it's chief *materials*, will be farre from being censured as *importune* and *impudent*, if he awake and call upon the *Inhabitants*, though every way his *betters* (especially if all his own estate lye therin also) although he be not *able* to carry one *vessel* of water to the quenching of it; I hope, that finding Persons endeavouring to put *fire* to the *house* of God, *which house ye are*, and labouring to steal away the whole Treasure thereof, wherein also my own *portion* doth lye, I shall not be condemned of *boldness*, or *presumption*, If I at *once cry* out to all persons however concern'd, to take heed that we be not utterly *despoyled* of our Treasure; though when I have *so done*, I be not able to give the least Assistance, to the *defence* of the *house*, or

quenching of the *fire* kindled about it. That of no leſs *importance* is this addreſs unto you, a brief diſcovery of it's occaſion will evince.

The Holy Ghoſt tels us, that *We are built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelfe being the chief corner ſtone, in whome the whole building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord, in whom we are built together for an habitation of God through the ſpirit*, Epheſ. 2. 20, 21, 22. And thus, doe all they become the *houſe of Chriſt*, *who hold faſt the confidence, and the hope of rejoycing to the end*, Heb. 3. 6. In this *Houſe of God* there are dayly *Builders*, according as new *living ſtones* are to *be fitted* to their place therin; and continual Oppoſitions have there been made thereto; and will be, *till we are come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the meaſure of the ſtature of the fulneſs of Chriſt*, Eph 4.13. In this work of *building* are ſome imployed by Jeſus Chriſt, and will be ſo to the end of the world (*Mat.* 28. 20. *Epheſ.* 4. 12.) and ſome *imploy* themſelves, at leaſt in a *pretence* thereof, but are indeed *to a man* every one like the *fooliſh woman, that puls down her houſe with both her hands.* Of the firſt ſort, *other foundation can no man lay*, nor doth goe about to lay, *ſave that which is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt*, 1 Cor. 3. 11. But ſome of them build on the foundation *Gold, ſilver, and precious ſtones*, keeping faſt in the work to the *forme of wholſome words*, and contending for *the faith that was once delivered to the Saints.*

Others againe lay *on wood, hay*, and *ſtubble*, either contending about *fooliſh Queſtions*: or *vaine and unprofitable janglings*, or *adding* to what God hath commanded, or *corrupting*, and *perverting* what he hath revealed and inſtituted, contrary to the *proportion of faith*, which ſhould be the *rule* of all their *propheſy*, where by they diſcharge their duty of *building* in this Houſe. Thoſe with *whom* I am at preſent *to deale*, and concerning *whom* I deſire to tender you the enſuing Accounts, are of the latter ſort, *ſuch*, as not content with others to *attempt* ſundry parts of the *building*, to *weaken* it's Contexture, or *deface* it's *Comelineſs*, doe with all their *might* ſet themſelves againſt the work it's ſelfe; the great *foundation* and *corner ſtone* of the Church, the *Lord Jeſus*, who *is God bleſſed for ever.* They are thoſe I ſay whom I would *warne* you of,

in

in whom of *old*, and of *late*, the *Spirit of Errour* hath set up it's selfe with such an *Efficacy* of Pride, and deluſion, as by all *wayes*, *meanes*, *devices* imaginable, to deſpoyle our *dear* and *bleſſed* Redeemer, our *holy one*, of his *Eternal power and Godhead*; or to *reject the Eternal Son* of God, and to ſubſtitute in his Room, a *Chriſt* of their own; one *like* themſelves, and no more; to *adulterate* the Church and turne aſide the Saints to a thing of nought. If I may enjoy your patience, whileſt I give a brief account of *them*, their *wayes* and *indeavours* for the compaſſing of their curſed Ends, *of our preſent concernment* in their actings, and ſeductions, of the *fire* kindled by them at our *doores*, of the ſad *diffuſion* of their *poyſon* throughout the world, beyond what *enters* into the hearts of the moſt of men to imagine, I ſhall *ſubjoyne* thereunto thoſe *cautions*, and *directions*, which withall *humbleneſs*, I have to tender to you, to *guide* ſome, and *ſtrengthen* others, and *ſtirre* up all, to be watchful againſt this *great*, and I hope the laſt *conſiderable Attempt* of *Sathan* (by way of Seduction and Temptation) againſt the foundation of the Goſpel.

Thoſe then who of *old* oppoſed the doctrine of the *Trinity*, eſpecially of the *Deity* of Chriſt, his *Perſon* and *Natures*, may be referred to *three* heads, and of them, and their wayes this is the ſumme.

The firſt ſort of *them* may be reckoned to be thoſe, who are commonly eſteemed to be *followers* of *Simon Magus*, known chiefly by the names of *Gnoſticks* and *Valentinians*: Theſe, with their abominable figments of *Æones*, and their *Combinations*, *Conjugations*, *Genealogies*, and *unintelligible imaginations*, whole overthrowing the whole *Revelation* of God concerning himſelfe and his *Will*, the *Lord Jeſus*, and the *Goſpel*, who chiefly with their leaders, *Marcus*, *Baſilides*, *Ptolomæus*, *Valentinus ſecundus*, (all following or imitating *Simon Magus* and *Menander*) of all others moſt perplexed and infected the Primitive Church. As *Irenæus*, *lib.* 1. *Tertullian*, *præſcrip. ad Hæret. cap.* 49. *Philaſtrius* in his catalogue of Heretickes, *Epiphanius in Panario lib.* 1. *Tom.* 2. And *Auguſtin* in his book of (*a*) *Hereſies*, *ad Quod vult Deus manifeſtè*. To theſe may be added *Tatianus*, *Cerdon*, *Marcion*, and their companions (of whom ſee *Tertullian* at large,

(*a*) Epiphan. Hæreſ. 47.

and *Eusebius* in their respective places.) I shall not separate from them *Montanus*, with his *Enthusiastical*, formal Associates; in whose Abominations it was hoped that these *latter dayes* might have been inconcerned, until the present *madnes* of some, commonly called *Quakers*, renewed their follies: but these may pass (with the *Manichees*) and those of the like fond *imaginations*, that ever and anon troubled the Church with their madness and folly.

Of the second *Ranke*, *Cerinthus* is the *head*, with (*b*) *judaizing Ebion*; both denying expresly the *Diety* of Christ, and asserting him to be but a *meere man*, even in the entrance of the *Gospel*; being confounded by *John*, as is affirmed by *Epiphanius*, *Hæres.* 51. *Hieronymus de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis de Johanne.* The same *Abomination* was againe revived by *Theodotus* called *Coriarius* (who having *once* denyed Christ, was resolved to doe so alwaies) excommunicated on that account by *Victor*, as *Eusebius* relates. *Hist. Eccles. l.* 5. *c. ult.* Where he gives also an account of his *Associates* in judgment; *Artemon*, *Asclepiodotus*, *Natalius &c.* and the books written against him are there also mentioned. But the most notorious *Head* and Patron of this madnes was *Paulus Samosatenus*, *Bishop* of *Antioch*, *An.* 272: of whose *pride* and *passion*, *folly*, *followers*, Assistants, Opposition, & excommunication, the history is extant at large in *Eusebius*. This man's *pomp*, *and folly*, his compliance with the *Jewes* and *Zenobia* the Queen of the *Palmyrians*, who then *invaded* the *Easterne* parts of the *Roman* Empire, made him so *infamous* to all Christians, that the *Socinians* do scarce plead for him, or own him as the Authour of their opinion. Of him who succeeded him in his Opposition to *Jesus Christ*, some 50 or 60 yeares after, namely *Photinus Bishop* of *Sirmium*, they constantly boast: of *Samosatenus* and his heresy, see *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib* 7. *cap* 29. 30. and *Hilary de Synodis*: *of Photinus*, *Socrat*: *Eccles. Hist. l.* 2 *cap.* 24 25. and with these doe *our present Socinians* (*c*) expresly agree in the matter of the person of Christ.

(b) Εβίων Σαμαρειτῶν ἔχει τὸ ἐδελυρὸν, Ἰουδαίων τὸ ὄνομα, Ναζωραίων τὴν γνώμην, Καρποκρατιανῶν τὴν κακοτροπίαν Epiph.

(c) *Injuriâ afficit Franken complures, qui hac de re idem aut senserunt aut sentiunt quod Socinus; & ne de iis qui hodiè vivunt, quidquam dicamus, duos tantum nominabimus, quorum alter ante annos mille ducentos, alter vero nostra ætate vixit. Ille Photinus fuit quondam Sirmii Episcopus, ipsorum etiam adversariorum testimonio divinarum literarum doctissimus &c: Faust. Socin: disputat. de Adorat. Christi. cum Christian. Franken. pag.* 29.

To

To the third head I referre that deluge of *Arianisme*, whose *Rise, Conception, Author*, and *Promoters*, Advantages, success, and propagation, the *Persecutions*, Cruelty and tyranny of the *Rulers, Emperours, Kings*, and *Governours* infected with it, it's Extent and Continuance, are *known* to all, who have taken care in the least, to inquire what was the state of the Church of God in former dayes: that *heresy* being as it were the *flood of waters*, that pursued the Church for some Ages. Of *Macedonius, Nestorius*, and *Eutyches*; the first denying the *Deity* of the *Holy Ghost*, the second the *hypostatical* Union of the two *natures* of Christ, and the last confounding them in his person, I shall not need to speak. These by the Socinians of our dayes are disclaimed. (d)

In the second sort chiefly we are at present concerned. Now to give an *Account*, from what is *come down* unto us, by Testimonies of good report and *esteem*, concerning those named, *Theodotus, Paulus, Photinus*, and the rest of men, who were the Predecessours of *them*, with whom we have to doe, and undertook the same Work in the infancy of the Church, which these are now ingaged in, when it is *drawing* with the world to it's *period*, with what were their *wayes, lives, Temptations, Ends, Agreements, differences* among them, and in reference to the *Persons* of our present *contests*, (of whom a full account shall be given) is not my ayme nor business. It *hath been* done by others: and to doe *it* with any *Exactnesse*, beyond what is *commonly* known, would take up more Roome then to this *Preface* is allotted. Some things peculiarly seem of concernment for our Observation, from the *time* wherin some of them acted their *parts*, in the service of their *Master*. What could possibly be more desired for the *safeguarding* of any *Truth*, from the Attempts of succeeding *Generations*, and for giving it a security above all *controul*, then that upon *publick* and *owned* Oppositon, it should receive a *Confirmation*, by men *acted* by the *Holy Ghost*, and giving out their *sentence* by *inspiration* from God. That among other *important* Heads of the Gospel (as that of *justification by faith*, and not by *works*, of *Christian Liberty*, of the *Resurrection* of the dead,) this most Glorious Truth of the *Eternal Deity of the Son of God*, underwent an open Opposition from *some* of them above written, during *the life* of some of the Apostles, before the writing of the *Gospel* by *John*,

(d) *Socin. ad Wicck cap. 9. p. 151. Smalc. Respon. ad lib. Smiglec. lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 1.*

and was expreſly *vindicated* by *him* in the beginning thereof, is acknowledged by all, who have in any meaſure *inquired into*, and *impartially weighed* the Reports of thoſe dayes. What could the heart of the moſt reſolved *Unbeliever* deſire more for his *ſatisfaction*, Then that *God* ſhould ſpeak from *heaven*. For the Conviction of his folly and ignorance? or what can our *Adverſaries* expect more from us, when we tell them, that God himſelfe, immediately determined in the Controverſy wherin they are engaged. Perhaps they *think*, that if he ſhould now *ſpeak* from heaven, they would *believe* him. So ſaid the *Jewes* to Chriſt, if he would come down from the *Croſs* when they had *nayled* him to it: In the ſight, & under the contempt of *many miracles* greater then the *delivery* of himſelfe could any way appear to be. The *rich man* in *torments* thought his *brethren* would *repent* if one came from the dead, and preached to them. *Abraham* tels him, *if they will not believe Moſes nor the Prophets*, they would not *believe* though one ſhould come from the dead. Doubtleſs if what is already *written*, be not ſufficient to *convince* our Adverſaries, though God ſhould *ſpeak from heaven*, they *would* not believe, nor indeed *can*, if they will abide by the *fundamental Principles* of their Religion. Under this great *diſadvantage*, did the *perſwaſion* of the *Socinians*, that Chriſt is only ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, by nature no *more* but *a man*, ſet out in the *world*; ſo that Perſons not deeply acquainted with the *methods of Sathan*, and the darknes of the *minds* of men, could not but be ready to *conclude it* certainly *bound up in ſilence* for ever. But how *ſpeedily* it *revived*, with what *pride* and *paſſion* it was *once* and *againe* endeavoured to be *propagated* in the world, thoſe who have read the ſtories of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, are fully acquainted, who γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ *blaſphemed the Son of God*, as *one* no *more* then a man. In ſome *ſpace* of time theſe men being decryed by the general Conſent of the *reſidue* of man-kind profeſſing the name of Jeſus Chriſt, and their *Abomination* deſtroyed by the *ſword of faith* managed in the hands of the Saints of thoſe days, *Satan* perceiving himſelfe at a *loſs*, and under an *impoſſibility* of prevalency, whilſt the *groſneſſe* of the errour he ſtrove to diffuſe, terrified all ſorts from having any thing to doe therewith; He puts on it by the help of *Arius* and his *followers* another *gloſs* and appearance, with a pretence of *allowing* Chriſt a *Deity*, though a *ſubordinate*

subordinate, *Created*, made *divine nature*, which in the *fulneſſe* of time aſſumed *fleſh of the Virgin*. This opinion being indeed no leſs really deſtructive to the true and *eternal Deity* of the Son of God, then that of theirs before mentioned, who expreſly affirmed him to be a mere man, and to have had no exiſtence before his nativity at *Bethlehem*, yet having got a *new pretence* and colour of aſcribing *ſomething* more *excellent* and *ſublime* unto him, then that whereof we are all in common partakers, it is *incredible* with what ſpeedy progreſs, like the *breaking* out of a *mighty flood*, it overſpread the face of the earth. It is true, it had in it's very *entrance*, all the Advantages of *Craft*, *Fraud*, and *Subtilty*; and in it's *carrying* on, of *violence*, *force* and *cruelty*; and from the *beginning* to it's *end*, of *ignorance*, *blindneſſe*, *ſuperſtition*, and *profaneneſſe*, among the *generality* of them, with whom it had to deale, that ever any *corrupt folly* of the mind of man met withal: The *Riſe*, *Progreſſe*, *Cruelty*, and *Continuance* of this *Sect*, with the *times* and *ſeaſons* that paſſed with it over the nations, it's entertainment by the many *barbarous* nations, which *waſted*, *ſpoyled*, and divided among themſelves the *Roman* Empire, with their parting with it upon almoſt as evill an *Account* as at firſt they embraced it, is not (as I ſaid) *my* buſineſs now to diſcover. God purpoſing to revenge the *Pride*, *Ingratitude*, *Ignorance*, *profaneneſſe*, and *Idolatry* of the World, which was then in a great meaſure got in amongſt the *Profeſſours of Chriſtianity*, by another, more ſpiritual, *cruel*, *ſubtile*, and *laſting* myſtery of iniquity, cauſed this Abomination of *Arianiſme* to give place to the power of the then growing *Roman* Antichriſtian ſtate; which about the *ſixt*, or *ſeaventh* Century of *yeares*, ſince the *Incarnation* of the Son of God, having loſt all *Church Order* and Communion of the inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt, fell into an earthly, *political*, *carnal* Combination, *authoriſed*, and *animated* by the ſpirit of Sathan for the Ends of *ſuperſtition*, *Idolatry*, *perſecution*, *pride*, *Atheiſme*, which thereby ever ſince vigorouſly purſued.

With theſe (*c*) *Arians* (as was ſaid) doe our *Socinians* refuſe

(*c*) *Ariani Chriſto divinum cultum non tribuerunt. Atqui longe præſtat Trinitarium eſſe quam Chriſto divinum cultum non tribuere. Imo Trinitarius (meo quidem judicio) modo alioqui Chriſti præcepta conſerveti, nec ulla ratione eos perſequatur, qui trinitarii non ſunt ſed potius cum ipſis fraternè conferre, ac veritatem inquirere non recuſet, merito Chriſtianus dici debet. Qui vero Chriſtum divina ratione*

tione non colit, is nullo modo Christianus dici potest: Quocirca non est dubitandum, quin Deo minus displicuerint Homousiani Trinitarii, quam vulgus Arianorum. Quid igitur mirum, si cum totus fere orbis Christianus in has duas (ut ita dicam) factiones divisus esset, Deus visionibus & miraculis testari voluisset utram ipsarum viam salutis vel adhuc retineret, vel jam abjecisset. Adde Arianos acerrimè tunc persecutos fuisse miseros Homousianos, idq; diu & variis in locis: Quare meritò se Deus Arianis iratum ostendit. Sozin. ad Weick. pag. 452.

fuse Communion, and will not be *called* after their *name*; not that their *profession* is better then theirs, or that they have *much* to blame, in what they divulge, though they agree not with them in allowing a *preexisting* nature to Christ before his Incarnation, but that, that Generation of men, having made themselves *infamous* to posterity, by their *wickedness*, *perjuries*, *crafts*, and bloody cruelties, & having been pursued by *eminent* and *extraordinary* judgments from God, they are not willing to partake of the *Prejudices* which they *justly lye* under.

From the year 600 for divers Ages, we have little noyse of these mens Abominations, as to the person of Christ, in the world. Sathan had something *else* to *busy* himselfe about.

A *designe* he had in *hand*, that was like to doe him more *service* then any of his former *attempts*. Having therefore tryed his *utmost* in open *opposition* to the person of Christ, (The dreggs of the poyson thus shed abroad infecting in *some measure* a great part of the *East* to this day) by a way never before heard of, and which *Christians* were not exercised with, nor in any *measure* aware of, he subtilly *ruines* and overthrowes *all his Offices*, and the whole benefit of his *mediation*, and introduceth secretly a *new Worship*, from that which he *appointed*, by the Meanes and endeavours of men, pretending *to Act*, and doe all that they did, for the *Advancement* of his Kingdome and Glory. And therefore, whilest the *fatal Apostacy* of the *westerne World*, under the *Roman Antichrist*, was contriving, carrying on, and *heightning*, till it came to it's discovery and ruine, he stirs not at all with his old *Engines*, which had brought in a *revenue* of *obedience* to his *kingdome*, in no measure *proportionable* to this, which by this *new* device he found accrewing to him. But when the *appointed Time* of *mercy* was come, that God would *visit* his people with light from above, and begin to *unravel the mystery of Iniquity*, whose Abominations had destroyed the *Soules* of them that embraced it, and whose *cruelty* had cut off the *lives* of *thousands* who had *opposed* it, by the reformation eminently and successively *begun* and carryed on,

from

from the year 1517; Sathan perceiving that even this his great *maſter-piece* of *deceit* and ſubtilty was like to *faile* him, and not to doe him that ſervice, which *formerly* it had done, he *againe* ſets on foot his firſt *deſigne* of oppugning the *Eternal Deity* of the Son of God; ſtill remembring that the *Ruine* of his Kingdome aroſe from the *God head* of his perſon, and the *Efficacy* of his Mediation. So that as for the *firſt* 300 yeares of the profeſſion of the name of Chriſt in the world, he had *variouſly* oppoſed the *God-head* of our bleſſed Saviour, by *Simon Magus*, *Ebion*, *Cerinthus*, *Paulus Samoſatenus*, *Marcus Baſilides*, *Valentinus*, *Colobarſus*, *Marcion*, *Photinus*, *Theodorus*, and others, and from their diſſipation and ſcattering, having gathered them *all* to an *head* in *Arius* and his Abomination; which ſometimes with a *mighty* prevalency of *force* and *violence*, ſometimes more *ſubtilly* (putting out by the way the ſeveral branches of *Macedonianiſme*, *Neſtorianiſme*, *Eutichianiſme*, all looking the ſame way in their tendency therewith) he managed almoſt for the ſpace of the next 300 years enſuing, and looſing at length that hold, he had ſpent more then *double* that ſpace of time, in carrying on his deſigne of the great Antichriſtian *Papal* Apoſtacy, being about the *times* before mentioned moſt cleerly and eminently diſcovered in his *wicked deſigne*, and being in *danger* to looſe his *kingdome*, which he had been ſo long in *poſſeſſion* of; intending if it were *poſſible* to retrive his *Advantage* againe; He ſets on thoſe men, who had been *inſtrumental* to reduce the Chriſtian Religion into it's primitive ſtate and Condition, with *thoſe* very *Errours* and Abominations, wherewith he oppoſed and aſſailed the *Primitive Profeſſours* thereof. If they will have the *Apoſtles doctrine*, they ſhall have the oppoſition that was made unto it in the *Apoſtles times*: His hopes being poſſibly the ſame, that formerly they were; but *aſſuredly* Chriſt will prevent him. For as whileſt the *Profeſſors* of the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt were *ſpiritual* & full of the power of that *Religion* they did profeſs, they defended the Truth thereof, either by ſuffering, as under *Conſtantius*, *Valens*, and the *Gothes* & *Vandals*; or by *ſpiritual* meanes and weapons; ſo when they were *carnal*, and loſt the life of the Goſpel, yet endeavouring to *retaine* the truth of the letter thereof, falling on *carnal politick* wayes for the *ſupportment* of it, and the *ſuppreſſing* of what oppoſed it, Sa-

tan quickly closed in with *them*, and accomplished all his ends by them, causing them to walk in all those wayes of *law*, *policy*, *blood*, *cruelty* and *violence*, for the Destruction of the Truth, which they first *ingaged* in, for the *rooting* out of *Errours* and *Heresies*; *haud ignota loquor*. Those who have considered the *Occasions* and *Advantages* of the *Bishop* of *Romes* rise and progress, know *these* things to be so. Perhaps (I say) he might have *thoughts* to manage the *same* or the *like* designe, at the beginning of the *Reformation*, when with great *craft* and subtilty, he set on *foot* againe his opposition to the *person* of Christ; which being the *businesse* cheifely under *Consideration*, I shall give some *brief* account thereof.

Those who have formerly *communicated* their thoughts and *Observations* to us, on this *subject*, have commonly given *rise* to their discourses from *Servetus*, with the *transactions* about him in *Helvetia*, and the ending of his *Tragedy* at *Geneva*. The *things* of *him* being commonly *known*, & my *designe* being to deale with them, in their *chief* seat and residence, where, after they had a while *hovered* about most *nations* of *Europe*, they *setled* themselves, I shall forbear to pursue them up and *downe* in their *flight*, and meet with them only at their *nest* in *Poland*, and the Regions adjoyning. The *Leaders* of them had *most* of them separated themselves from the *Papacy*, on pretence of *embracing* the reformed *Religion*; and under that Covert were a *long time* sheltred from *violence*, and got many Advantages of *insinuating* the Abominations (which they were throughly *drenched* withall, before they left the *Papacy*) into the *minds* of many who *professed* the Gospel.

The first open *breach* they made in *Poland*, was in the year, 1562, (something having been attempted before) being most of the Leaders, (*f*) *Italians*, men of *subtile* and *serpentine* wits. The chief Leaders of them were *Georgius Blandrata*, *Petrus* Stato-

(*f*) *De tribus inunâ divinâ essentiâ personis Anno* 1562, *controversiam movêrunt, in min. Pol. Itali quidam advenæ; præcipui autem assertores contra S. S. Trinitatem fuêre, Georgius Blandrata Theologus ac Medicus, Petrus Statorius*, Tonvillanus, *Franciscus* Lismaninus *Theologiæ Doctor, quorum tamèn ab initio opera reformationis valdè fuit Ecclesiæ Dei procsiua:* Histor. Eccles. *Slavon. lib.* 1. *pag.* 84.

rius

rius, *Franciscus Lismaninus*, all which had been *eminent* in promoting the Reformation.

Upon their first *Tumultuating*, *Statorius*, to whom afterwards *Socinus* wrote sundry *Epistles*, and lived with him in great *intimacy*, was *summoned* to a meeting of *ministers*, upon an Accusation, that he denyed that the *Holy Spirit was to be invocated*. Things being not yet *ripe*, the man knowing, that if he were *cast out* by them, he should not know where to *obtaine shelter*, he *secured* himselfe by *dissimulation*, and subcribed this *Confession*: (g) *I receive and reverence the Prophetical, and Apostolical doctrine, containing the true knowledge of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and freely professe, that God the Father Son and Holy Ghost ought to be worshiped with the same religion or Worship, distinctly, or respectively, and to be invocated according to the truth of the Holy Scripture And lastly I doe plainely Detest every Heretical blasphemy, concerning God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, whether it be Arian, Servetian, Eunomian*, or *Stancarian*. And this *Confession* is to be seen in the Acts of that *Convention*, under his own hand to this day; which notwithstanding, he was a fierce *Opposer* of the doctrine here *professed* all his dayes afterward.

(g) *Propheticam & Apostolicam doctrinam quæ veram Dei patris, filii, & spiritus sancti cognitionem continet, amplector ac veneror, pariqué Religione Deum patrem filium & spiritum sanctum distinctè secundum sacrarum literarum veritatem colendum, implorandúmque precibus, liberè profiteor: Denique omnem hæreticam de Deo patre filio & spiritu sancto blasphemiam, planè detestor, sive Ariana illa, sive Servetiana, sive Eunomiana, sive Stancariana. Act Eccles. mino. Pol. Synod. Pinczovian. An. 1559.*

And I the rather mention this, becaufe I am not without too much *ground* of *perswasion*, that *thousands* of the same *judgment* with this man, doe at *this* day, by the like *dissimulation*, live and enjoy many *Advantages* both in the *Papacy*, and among the *reformed* Churches, spreading the *poyson* of their *Abominations* as they *can*.. This *Statorius* I find by the *frequent* mention made of him by *Socinus*, to have lived *many yeares* in *Poland*, with what *End* and issue of his life I know not; nor *more* of him, but what is contained in *Beza's* two *Epistles* to him, whose *Scholar* he had been, when he seemed to have had other *opinions* about the *Essence* of God, then those he afterwards *setled* in, by the instruction of *Socinus*.

And this man was one of the *first* heads of that *multitude* of of men, commonly known by the name of *Anabaptists*, among the *Papists* (who took notice of little but their *outward worship*) who having entertained *strange*, wild, and *blasphemous* thoughts concerning the *Essence* of God, were afterwards *brought* to a kind of setlement by *Socinus*, in that *Religion* he had prepared to

serve them all, and into his word at last consented the whole droves of *Essentiators*, *Tritheits*, *Arians*, and *Sibellians* that *swarmed* in those dayes, in *Silesia*, *Moravia*, and some other parts of *Germany*.

For *Blandrata*, his *story* is so well *known*, from the *Epistles* of *Calvin* and *Beza*, and *others*, that I shall not insist much upon it. The *summe* of what is commonly *known* of him is Collected by *Hornbecke*.

The *Records* of the *Synods* in *Poland* of the Reformed Churches, give us somewhat *farther* of him, as doth *Socinus* also against *Wiek*. Being an *excellent Physitian*, he was entertained at his first coming into *Poland*, by Prince *Radzivil*, the then great *Patron* of the *reformed* Religion in those parts of the world: one of the *same* family with *this*, *Captaine* general of the *Polonian* forces, for the great *Dukedome* of *Lithuania*, a man of great *successe* in many fights and battels against the *Muscovites*, continuing the same *Office* to this day. To him (*h*) *Calvin* instantly wrote, that he should take care of *Blandrata*, as a man not only *inclinable* to, but wholy infected with *Servetianisme*: In *that*, as in *many* other things, he admonished men of by his Epistles, *that wise and diligent* person had the *fate* to *tell the Truth*, and not be *believed*. See *Calvins Epistles* about the year 1561: but the man on this *occasion*, being sent to the *meeting* at *Pinkzove*, (as *Statorius*,) he *subscribes* this Confession.

(*h*) *De Georgio Blandrata, pro singulari suo in Ecclesiam Dei amore præmonuit Polonos Cl. Vir Johan. Cal quin etiam Illustrissimum Principē Palatinum, Vilocensem, Nicolaum Radzivilium, cujus Patrocinio Blandrata tum utebatur. Subolfererat enim vir doctus Blandratæ ingenium ad Servetti sententiam esse compositū: itaque serius principi suasor fuit, ut sibi ab eo caveret, sed homo ille facile, technis suis fallacibus, optimo Principi fucum fecit, adeò ut ille iratus Johanni Calvino, Blandratam nomine suo ad Synodum Piuckzovienſem Anno 1561. 25. Jun. habitam, delegaret cum literis, quibus serio postulabat in causa Blandratæ, cum Ecclesiā, diceb. tque male & præcipitanter egisse Calvinum, quod Blandratam tra ucceret, & Servetismi notaret. Regen Hist. l. 1. p. 85.*

(*i*) *I professe my selfe to believe in one God the Father, and in one Lord Jesus Christ his Son, and in one Holy Ghost, whereof each is essentially God. I detest the plurality of Gods, seeing to us there is one onely God, indivisible in essence; I confesse three distinct persons, the eternal Deity and generation of Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost true and eternal God proceeding from them both.*

(*i*) *Fateor me credere in unum Deum patrem & in unum dominum Jes. Christum filium ejus, & in unum Spiritum sanctum, quorum quilibet est essentialiter Deus; Deorum pluralitatem detestor: cum unus tantum sit nobis Deus, essentia indivisibilis: fateor tres esse distinctas hypostases & æternam Christi Divinitatem & generationem; & Spiritum Sanctum unum & æternum Deum ab utroque procedentem: Act. Synod. Pinczov: Anno 1561.*

This

This did the *wretched man* think meet to doe, that he might preserve the *good esteem* of his *Patron*, and *reserve* himselfe for a *fitter* opportunity of doing mischief: which also he did, obtaining a *Testimonial* from the whole *meeting* of his *soundnesse* in the faith, with *letters* to *Prince Radzivil*, and to *Calvin signifying* the same.

Not long after *this* by the great *repute* of his *skill* in *Physick* he became known, and *Physitian* to *Stephen King of Poland*; by whose *favour* having no small *Liberty* indulged him, he became the *Patron* of all the *Antitrinitarians* of all *sorts* throughout *Poland* and *Transilvania*: What *Books* he wrote, and what *paines* he took in propagating their *cause*, hath been declared by others. The last Epistle of *Socinus* in order as they are *printed*, (it being without date; yet evidently written many yeares before most of them that went before it) is to this *Blandrata*; whose inscription is, *Amplissimo Clarissimoq; Viro Georgio Blandratæ Stephani invictissimi* Regis *Poloniæ, &c. Archiatro & conciliario intimo, Domino, ac patrono suo perpetuâ observantiâ colendo: & subscribitur, Tibi in Domino Jesu deditissimus Cliens Tuus* F. S. To that *esteem* was he *grown* amongst them, because of his *Advantages* to insinuate them into the knowledge of *great men*, which they *mostly* aymed at. So that afterwards, when *Socinus* wrote his *Answer* about *Magistrates*, to *Palæologus* in defence of the Racovians, (k) *Marcellus Squarcialupus* his *countrey-man* a man, of the *same perswasion* with him, fals *fouly* on him, that he would *venture* to doe it, without the knowledge and consent of this great *Patron of theirs*.

But though *this* man by his *dissimulation* and falsehood, thus escaped *Censure*, and by his *Art* and *cunning* insinuation, obtained *high promotions*, and *heaped* up great *riches* in the *world*, yet even in this *life* he escaped not the *revenging* hand of God. He was found at *length* with his *Neck* broke in his *bed*, by what hand none knoweth. Wherefore (l) *Socinus* observing that this *Judgment* of

(k) *Dixit heri vir amplissimus Blandrata, librum se tuum contra Palæologum accepisse: Habes tu unum saltem cui sis charissimus, cui omnia debes, qui judicio maxime polleat, cur tantum studium, consiliique pondus neglexisti? poteras non tantum ejus censuram, absoluti jam libri petere, sed consilium postulare de subeundo non levi labore. Et possum affirmare senis consilium tibi sine dubio si petivisti, profuturum fuisse. Ep. Marcel. Squarc. ad Faust. Socin.*

(l) *Monendum Lectorem harum rerum ignarum censui, Blandratam haud paulum ante mortem suam vivente adhuc Stephano Rege Poloniæ, in illius gratiam, & quo illum erga se liberaliorem (ut fecit) redderet, plurimum remisisse de studio suo in Ecclesiis nostris Transilvanicis nostrisque hominibus juvandis: imo eo tandem devenisse ut vix existimaretur priorem quam tantopere foverat de Deo & Christo sententiam retinere, sed potiùs Jesuitis qui in eâ provinciâ tunc temporis Stephani Regis & ejus fratris Christopheri haud multo ante vitam functi ope ac liberalitate non mediocriter florebant, jam adhærere aut certe cum eis quodammodo colludere. Illud certissimum est, cum ab eo tempore quo liberalitatem quam ambiebat Regis Stephani erga se est expertus, cœpisse quosdam ex nostris hominibus quos charissimos prius habebat, & suis opibus juvabat spernere, ac deserere, etiam contra promissa*

God upon him, as that of *Franciscus David*, (of which mention shall be made afterwards) would be *fixed* on, in the *thoughts* of men, to the *prejudice* of the *Cause* which he *favoured*, considering *more* what was for his *interest*, then what was *decent*, or convenient; *decryes* him for an *Apostate* to the *Jesuites*, before he was so *destroyed*; and intimates that he was *strangled in his bed*, by a *kinsman* whom he had made his *heire*, for hast to take possession of his *great* wealth.

promissa & obligationem suam, & tandem illos penitus deseruisse, atque omni veræ & sinceræ pietatis studio valedixisse, & solis pecuniis congerendis intentum fuisse, quæ fortasse justissimo Dei judicio, quod gravissimum exercere solet contra tales desertores, ei necem ab eo quem suum hæredem fecerat conciliarunt Socinus ad Weik. cap. 2 pag. 43. 44.

The *story* I have *adjoyned* at large, that the *man's ingenuity* and thankfulness to his *friend* and *Patron* may be seen. He tels us that before the *death* of *Stephen* King of *Poland* he was turned from their *profession* by the *Jesuites*. *Stephen* King of *Poland* died in the year 1588. according to *Helvicus*. That *very* year did *Socinus* write his answer to *Volanus*; the second part whereof he *inscribed* with all the *magnifical Titles* before mentioned, to *Blandrata*; professing himself his *Devoted Client*; and him the great *Patron* of their Religion: so that though I can *easily* believe what he reports of his *Covetousnes* and *Treachery*, and the manner of his death, yet as to his *Apostacy* (though possibly he might *fall* more and more under the power of his *Atheisme*,) I suppose the great Reason of imputing *that* to him, was to avoid the *scandal* of the *fearful* judgment of God on him in his death.

For *Lismaninus* the third person *mentioned*; he was accused of *Arianisme* at a *Convention* at (*m*) *Morden*: Anno 1553. And there *acquitted* with a Testimonial. But in the year 1561, at another meeting at *Whodristave*, he was convicted of *double dealing*, and after that wholy fell off to the *Antitrinitarians*, and in the issue, (*n*) *drowned himself* in a *well*.

Act. Synod. Mordon. An. 1553.

Bez. Epist. 81.

And these were the *chief* setled *Troublers* at the first, of the *Polonian* reformed Churches; the stories of *Paulus Alciatus*, *Valentinus Gentilis*, *Bernardus Ochinus*, & some others, are so well known out of the *Epistles* of *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Bullinger*, *Zanchius*, with what hath of *late* from them been *collected* by *Cloppenburgius*, *Hornbeck*, *Maresius*, *Becmanuus*, *&c.* that it cannot but be *needlesse* labour for me to goe *over* them againe. That which I *aime* at is, from their *own writings*, and what remaines on *record* concerning

concerning them, to give a brief accompt of the *first* breaking in of *Antitrinitarianisme* into the *reformed Churches of Poland*, and their *confused* Condition, before headed by *Socinus*, into whose *name* they have since been all baptized.

This then was the State of the *Churches* in those days. The *reformed* Religion spreading in great abundance, and Churches being *multiplied* every day in *Poland*, *Lithuania*, and the parts adjoyning, some *tumults* having been *raised*, and *stirs* made by *Osiander* and *Stancarus*, about the *essential* Righteousnesse, and *mediation* of Christ, (concerning which the Reader may consult *Calvin* at large) Many wild and *foolish Opinions* being *scattered* up and down, about the *Nature* of *God* the *Trinity* and *Anabaptisme*, by many *Forreigners*, sundry being thereby defiled. The opinions of *Servetus* having wholy infected sundry *Italians*. The *Persons* before spoken of then living at *Geneva*, and about the townes of the *Switzers*, that embraced the *Gospel*, being *forced* to *flee* for *fear* of being *dealt* withal as *Servetus* was, (the judgment of most *Christian* Rulers in whose days leading them to such a *proceedure*, how *rightly*, I doe not now determine,) scarce any *one* of them escaping without *imprisonment* and *abjuration*, (an ill *Foundation* of their after *Profession*) They went most of them into *Poland*, looked on by them, as a *Place* of *Liberty*, and joyned *themselves* to the *Reformed Churches* in those places: And continuing *many years* in their *Communion*, took the *opportunity* to *entice* and *seduce* many *Ministers* with *others*, and to strengthen them who were *fallen* into the (*Abominations* mentioned, before their coming to them.

After many *Tergiversations*, many *examinations* of them, many false *subscriptions*, in the year (*o*) 1562 they *fell* into *open division* and separation from the *Reformed* Churches. The *Ministers* that felloff with them besides *Lismannus*, and his companion (of whom before) were *Gregorius Pauli*, *Stanislaus*, *Lutonius Martinus* Crovicius, *Stanislaus Paclesius*, *Georgius Schomanus* and others, Most of *whom* before had taken *good paines* in *preaching* the *Gospel*: the chief *Patrons* & *Promoters* were *Johannes Miemol-*

(*m*) *Cum dicijus non possint in Ecclesiis delitescere, manifesto scismate Petriconiæ Anno 1562. habito prius colloquio coram scindunt & in sententiam suam pertrahunt plurimostium ex ministris, tum ex Patronis. Ministri qui partem eorum sequebantur erant in principio Gregorius Pauli: &c. Histor: Eccles: Slavon: Regn. lib. 1. pag. 86.*

jevius

Lælius interim præmatura morte extinctus est; incidit mors in diem parentinum: Maii 1562. ætatis vero ejus septimi supra trigesimum. Eques Polon. vita Fauſt. Socin. Senenſ.

jevius, Hieronymus Philoponius, Joannes Cazaccovius, the one a Judge, the other a Captaine, the third a *Gentleman*, all men of great eſteem.

The (*n*) *yeare* that this *Breach* was made *Lælius Socinus* then of the age of 37 yeares, who layd the *foundations* that his *Nephew* after *built* upon, died in *Switzerland*; As the Authour of the Life of *Fauſtus Socinus* informes us. The man's Life is known: he was full of *Servetianiſme*, and had attempted to *draw* ſundry *men* of *note* to his *Abominations*: A Man of great *ſubtilty* and *Cunning*, as (*o*) *Beza* ſays of him, *incredibly furniſhed* for contradiction and *Sophiſmes*: Which the *Authour* of the *Life of Socinus* phraſes, He was *ſuggerendæ veritatis mirus artifex*. He made (as I ſaid) many *private* attempts on *ſundry* Perſons to entice them to *Photinianiſme*; on ſome with *ſucceſſe*, on others without. Of his dealing with him, and the *Advantage* he had *ſo* to doe, (*p*) *Zanchius* gives an account in his preface to his book *de tribus Elohim*.

(*o*) *Fuit etiam Lælius Socinus Senenſis incredibiliter ad contradicendum & varios nectendos dolos comparatus; nec niſi poſt mortem cognitus, hujuſmodi pernitioſiſſimis hæreſibus laborare. Epiſt. ad Eccle. Orthodox. Epiſt. 81.*

He was, as the *Authour* of the Life of *Fauſtus Socinus* relates in a *readineſſe* to have publiſhed his *Notions* and *Conceptions*, when God by his *merciful providence*, to prevent a *little* the pouring out of the *poyſon*, by ſo *skilful* an hand, took him *off* by ſudden Death; and *Fauſtus* himſelfe gives the ſame account of the *ſeaſon* of his death in an Epiſtle to (*q*) *Dudithius*.

(*p*) *Fuit is Lælius nobili honeſtaq; familia natus, bene græce & Hebraice doctus, vitæque etiam externæ inculpatæ quarum rerum cauſa mihi quoque intereſſerat cum illo non vulgaris amicitia, ſed homo fuit plenus diverſarum hæreſium, quas tamen mihi nunquam proponebat niſi diſputandi Cauſa, & ſemper interrogans, quaſi cuperet doceri: hanc vero Samoſatanianam imprimis annos multos fovit, & quoſcunque potuit pertraxit in eundem errorem: pertraxit autem non paucos: me quoque ut dixi diverſis tentabat rationibus, ſi eodem poſſit errore ſimul, & æterno exitio ſecum involvere. Zanch. Præfat. ad lib. de tribus.*

At his death, *Fauſtus Socinus* being then about the *age* of 23 yeares, *ſeizing* upon *all* his *Uncles books*, after a while returned into Italy; and there ſpent in *Courtſhip* and *Idleneſſe* in *Florence* 12 *yeares*, which he afterwards *greivouſly lamented*, as ſhall be declared: Leaving him a while to his *pleaſure* in the *Court* of the great *Duke*, we may make *back againe* into *Poland*, and conſider the *progres* of the *perſons*, who made *way* for his *coming* amongſt them. Having made their ſeparation, and drawn many *after them*, they at length brought their *buſineſſe* to that *height*, that they came

(*q*) *Cum amicorum precibus permotus tandem conſtituiſſet, atque etiam cæpiſſet, ſaltem inter ipſos, nonnulla in apertum proferre. Socin. ad Andræum Dudithium.*

to

to a *disputation* (*r*) with the *reformed Ministers* at *Petricove*, (where the *Parliament* of the *Kingdome* then was,) by the permission of *Sigismund* the *King*, in the year 1565 whereof the ensuing account is given by *Antonius Possevine* the *Jesuite*, in *Atheis: sui sæculi cap.* 13. *fol.* 15.

The *Assembly* of States, was called against the *Muscovians*; the *Nobility* desiring a *Conference* between the *Ministers* of the Reformed *Churches* and the *Antitrinitarians*, it was allowed by *Sigismund* then King. On the part of the *Reformed Churches* there were *four Ministers:* as *many* of the other side came also *prepared* for the *Encounter*: Being met, after some discourse, the *chief Martial* of the Kingdome then a *Protestant*, used these words. (*s*) Seeing the *Proposition to be debated is agreed on*, *begin in the Name of the one God, and the Trinity.*

Whereupon one of the *opposite* party instantly *cryed out*;

(*t*) *We cannot here say Amen: nor doe we know that God, the Trinity.*

Whereunto the *Ministers* (*u*) subjoyned, *we have no need of any other proposition*, seeing *this hath offer'd it selfe; for God assisting we will, and are ready to demonstrate that the Holy Ghost doth not teach us any Other God in the Scripture, but him only, Who is Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost; that is, one God in Trinity.*

This *colloquy* continued three dayes: in the first the *Ministers* who were the *Opponents* (the other alwaies choosing to *answer*) by expresse *Texts* of *Scripture* in abundance, confirmed the *truth*. In the *beginning* of their *Testimonies*, they appealed to the (*w*) *beginning* of the *old*, and *new* Testament, and upon both *places* confounded their Adversaries.

The *Second* Day the *Testimonies* of the *Ancient Writers* of the Church were produced, with no less success.

(*r*) *Cum his Antitrinitariis publicam habuerunt Evangelici disputationem Petricoviæ in comitiis Regni Sigism.* 11. *Aug. Rege permittente Anno.* 1565. *Disputatores fuerunt, &c. Regenvolscius. Vbi supra.*

(*s*) *Fam igitur constituta propositione qua de agendum est, in nomine Dei unius & Trinitatis exordimini.*

(*t*) *Nos vero hic non dicimus Amen, neque enim nos novimus Deum istum Trinitatem.*

(*u*) *Nulla jam alia propositione nobis opus est, cum hæc se obtulerit, nos autem Deo volente, &* volumus, *&* parati sumus *demonstrare, quod* Spiritus Sanctus *non alium nos Deum in Scriptura doccat, nisi solum Patrem, Filium, & Spiritum Sanctum, id est, Deum unum in Trinitate.*

(*w*) *Nos quidem ô amici haud difficulter poterimus vobiscum eam rem transigere, nam ubi primum biblia aperueritis, & initium veteris & novæ legis consideraveritis, statim offendetis, id ibi asseri quod vos pernegatis, sic enim Geneseos primo Scriptura loquitur.* Faciamus hominem ad imaginem nostram. *Nostram inquit, non meam: postea vero addit, Fecit Deus. Novæ autem Legis initium hoc est* Verbum erat apud Deum, & Verbum erat Deus. *Videtis ut in veteri lege loquatur unus Deus tanquam de tribus: hic vero quod Filius, Verbum æternum (nam quod ab initio erat, æternum est) erat apud Deum, & erat idem, non alius, uti vos perperam intrepretamini, Deus.*

And on the *Third*; The *Stories* of *Arius*, and some other *Hereticks* of old. The Issue of the disputation was to the great *Advantage* of the *Truth*, which *Possevine* himselfe cannot deny: though he affirme a little after, that the *Calvinists* could not *confute* the *Trinitarians* (as he cals them) though they used the *same Arguments* that the *Catholicks* did, *cap.* 14. *pag.* 366.

(*x*) *Possevine* confesses, that the Ministers (as they called themselves of *Salmatia* and *Transylvania*) in their book of the *true* and *false knowledge of God*, took advantage at the *Images* of the *Catholicks*; for whose satisfaction (it seemes) he subjoynes the *Theses* of *Thyreus*, wherein he labours to prove the use of those abominable *Idols* to be Lawful, of which in the *close* of this address.

(x) *Mox agunt de imaginibus sanctissimæ Trinitatis, non contenti simpliciorum quorundam picturas convellere, eas item quæ ab Ecclesia Catholica rite usurpatæ sunt, scommatibus & Blasphemis carminibus proscindunt. Anton. Possev. Lib. 8. cap. 15. 16.*

And this was the *first* great *obstacle*, that was *layed* in the way of the *progresse* of the *reformed Religion* in *Poland*: which by *Satan's* taking the Advantage of this horrible *scandal*, is at this day in those *parts* of the world, *weak* and oppressed. With what *power* the Gospel did *come* upon the *Inhabitants* of those *Nations* at the first, and what *number* of Persons it prevailed upon to forsake their *dumb Idols*; which in *Ægyptian* darkness they had *long worshipped*; is evident from the *Complaint* of (*y*) *Gichovius* the *Priest*, who tels us, that *about those times in the whole Parliament of the Dukedome of Lithuania, there were not above one or two Catholicks* (as he cals them) *besides the Bishops.*

(*y*) *Profecto illis temporibus res catholicorum fere deplorata erat: cum in amplissimo Senatu vix unus aut alter præter Episcopos reperiebatur. Casper Cichovius Canon. & Parock. Sardom. Alloquia.*

Yea among the *Bishops* themselves, some were come *off* to the *reformed Churches*: amongst whom *Georgius Petrovicius*, Bishop of *Sarmogitia* is reckoned by *Diatericus Chron. pag.* 49.

Yea and *so* far had the *Gospel* influenced those *Nations*, that in the year 1542, upon the death of King *Sigismund* the *second*, during the *Interregnum*, a decree was made in *Parliament* with generall Consent, that no *prejudice* should arise to *any* for the *Protestant Religion*; but that a firme *Union* should *be* between the *Persons* of both *Religions*, *Popish* and *Protestant*. And that whosoever was *chosen King*, should take an *oath* to preserve this Union, and the Liberty of the *Protestant Religion*. (*Sarricius. Annal. Pol. lib.* 8. *pag.* 403.)

And

And when (*a*) *Henry Duke of Anjow*, Brother to *Charles* the *ninth*, *King* of *France*, was elected *King* of *Poland*, (being then a man of great *esteem* in the *World*, for the *Wars* which in *France* he had managed for the *Papists against* the *Prince* of *Conde*, and the never enough magnified * *Gasper Coligni*, being also *consenting* at *least*, to the *barbarous massacre* of the *Protestants* in that Nation,) and coming to the *Church* where he was to be *crowned*, by the advice of the *Clergy*, would have avoided the *Oath* of *Preserving* the *Protestants*, and keeping peace between the *dissentours* in Religion, *John Shirli*, *Palatine* of *Cracovia*, took up the *Crowne*, and making *ready to goe away* with it out of the Convention, cryed out, *si non jurabis non Regnabis. If you will not sweare you shall not reigne*, and thereby *compelled* him to take the Oath agreed upon.

This *Progresse* (I say) had the Doctrine of the *Gospel* made in *those Nations*, so considerable a portion of the *body of the people* were wonne over to the *belief* of it, when through the *Craft* and *Subtilty* of the *old* enemy of the *propagation* thereof, this *Apostacy* of some to *Treithi'me*, as *Georgius Pauli*, of some to *Ariani'me*, as *Erasmus Johannes*, of some to *Photinianisme*, as *Statorius*, *Blandrata*, some to *Judaisme*, as *Sidelius* (of whom afterwards) the foundation of the whole building was *loosned*, and instead of a *Progesse*, the Religion has gone *backwards* almost constantly to this Day. When this difference first *fell* out, the (*b*) *Papists* not once moved a *mouth*, or *pen* for a *long time*, against the *Broachers* of all the *Blasphemies* mentioned, hoping that by the *breaches* made by them on the *reformed Churches*, they should at length be *able* to *triumph* over both. For which End in their disputes since with Protestants, they have striven to make Advantage of the *Apostacy* of many of those who had pretended to plead against the *Papacy*, in behalfe of the *reformed Churches*, and afterwards turned *Antitrinitarians*: as I remember it is particularly *insisted* on in an *English Treatise*, which I *saw many yeares agoe*, called

(*a*) *Neque verò hoc juramentum pro tuenda pace Evangelica præstitisset, ni si cum Johannes Shirli Palatinus Cracovienſis, Vir plenus Zeli & magnæ cum potentia authoritatis, adegisset; Fortunæ cum Rex Henricus jam coronandus esset, nec pacem inter dissidentes se conservaturum juraſſet, sed silentio illudere vellet, acceptâ quæ Regi tum præferebatur corona, exitum ex templo paraſſe, & in hæc prorupisse verba, si non jurabis non regnabis. Hist. Eccles. Slavon. Regenvol. lib 1. pag. 92.*

(*) *Condæo succedit* Colignius, *vir natalibus & militia clarus, qui nisi Regi suo moveret bellum, dissidii fomes & caput, virtutis heroicæ exemplar erat, supra antiquos duces, quos mirata est Græcia, quos Roma extulit. Gramond. Histor Gal. lib 6.*

(*b*) *Quid interea bonus ille Hosius Cardinalis cum suis Catholicis? Nempe ridere suaviter, & quasi ista nihil ad ipsos pertinerent, aliud quidvis agere, imo etiam nostros undiq; ad extinguendum hoc incendium accurrentes, probrosis libellis arcessere. Beq. Ep. 81.*

led *Micheas* the *Converted* Jew: and indeed it is *supposed*, that both *Paulus* (c) *Alciatus*, and *Ochinus* turned *Mahumetans*.

Having thus then disturbed the *Carrying* on of the *Reformation*, many *Ministers* and *Churches* falling off to *Treithisme* and *Samosatenianisme*, they layd the Foundation of their *meeting* at *Racovia*, from which place they have been most *known* since, & taken *notice* of in the world. The first foundation of what they call the *Church* in that place, was made by a *confluence* of *Strangers* out of (d) *Bohemia* and *Moravia*, with some *Polonians*, known only by the name of *Anabaptists*, but professing a *Community of goods*, and a *setting* up of the *Kingdome* of Christ: calling *Racovia*, where they *met*, the *new Jerusalem*, or at least *professing*, that there they intended to *build* and *establish* the *new Jerusalem*, with other *Phanatical Follies*, which Satan hath *revived* in *persons* not unlike them, and caused to be *acted* over againe in the Dayes wherein we live: though for the *most part* with lesse *appearance* of *holinesse* and *integrity* of Conversation, then in them, who went before.

(c) *Cum Gentilis de Paulo Alciato sodali suo rogaretur, factus est inquit Mahumetanus. Beza. Epist. ubi supra.*

(d) *Erant alii quoque Antitrinitarii sectæ Anabaptisticæ per Bohæmiam & Moraviam longe latéque serpentis Sectatores, qui absurdam illam bonorum communionem observaturi ultro abjectis suis conditionibus Racoviam se contulerunt. Novam Hierusalem ibi loci exstructuri, (ut aiebant) ad hanc ineptam sodalitatem plurimos invitabant nobiles, &c. Regen. lib. 1. pag. 90.*

The *Leaders* of these men who called themselves their *Ministers*, were *Gregorius Pauli*, and *Daniel Bielenscius*, of whom *Bielenscius* afterwards *recanted*, and (e) *Gregorius Pauli* being utterly *wearied*, ran away from them, as from a hard service.

And as *Faustus Socinus* tels us in his Preface to his answer to *Palæologus*, in his *old age* left off all *study*, and betook himselfe to *other imployments*: such were the Persons by whom this stir began.

This *Gregorius Pauli*, (f) *Schlusselburgius* very ignorantly affirmes to have been the *head* of the *Antitrinitarians*, and their *Captaine*, when he was a mere Common *Trooper* amongst them, and followed after others, running away betimes: an *enthusiastical*, *Antimagistratical* heretick, pleading for community of goods. But this *Gregory* had said, that *Luther* did but the least part of the work, for the destruction of *Antichrist*: & thence is the Anger of Doctour *Cunradus*, who every where shews himselfe as Zealous of the honour of *Luther*, as of Jesus Christ. So was the man, who had some divinity, but scarce any *latine* at all.

(e) *Quid commemorem animosi illius Gregorii Pauli insalutato suo grege fugam, Bez.*

(f) *Novi isti Ariani exorti sunt in Polonia, Lithuania, et ipsa nimirum Transilvania, ac eorum caput & ducem se profitetur Gregorius Pauli minister Ecclesiæ Racovienses, Homo impius, ambitiosus, & in blasphemiis effutiendis plane effrænis: & ita quidem jactabundus, ut adscribere sibi, cum aliis Arianis, non vereatur excisionem Antichristi; & ejusdem extirpationem ab imis fundamentis: Lutherum enim vix minimã partem revelationis Antichristi reliquisse: Schlusselburg: de Antitri: p. 3.*

Be pleased now to take a briefe *view* of the State of these men, before the coming of *Faustus Socinus* into *Poland* and *Transilvania*: both those *Nations* after the *death* of *Sigismund* the *second*, being in the Power of the same *family* of the *Bathori*. Of those who *professed* the *reformed* Religion, and were *falne* from the *Papacy*, there were *three* sorts; *Lutherans*, and *Calvinists*, and the *United Brethren*; which last were originally *Bohemian exiles*, but professing and *practising* a *more strict* way of *Church* order and *fellowship* then the other, had very many of the *nobility* of *Poland*, and the *people* joyned to their *communion*. The two *latter* agreed in all *points* of *Doctrine*, and at *length* came in sundry *meetings* and *Synods* to a *faire* Agreement and *correspondency*, forbearing *one* another, wherein they could not concurre in Judgment: Now as these *grew* up to *Union* amongst *themselves*, the *mixed multitude* of several *Nations* that had joyned *themselves* with them in their *departure* out of *Ægypt*, fell a *lusting* after the *Abominations* mentioned: and *either withdrew* themselves, or were *thrown out* from their Communion.

At *first* there were almost as *many minds* as *men* amongst them: the *tessera* of their *Agreement* among themselves, being purely *Opposition* to the *Trinity*, upon what principles soever; Had a man learned to *Blaspheme* the *Holy Trinity*, were it on *Photinian*, *Arian*, *Sabellian*, yea *Mahumetan*, or *Judaical* principles, he was a *companion* and *brother* amongst them. To this, the most of them added *Anabaptisme*, with the *necessity* of it, and among the *Papists* were known by no other *name*. That they opposed the *Trinity*, that they *Consented* not to the *Reformed Churches*, was their Religion: For *Pelagianisme*, afterwards introduced by *Socinus*, there was *little* or *no* mention among them. In this *Estate* divided amongst themselves, notwithstanding some *attempts* in their *Synods* (For *Synods* they had) to keep a kind of *Peace* in all their diversities of *opinions*, spending their time in *disputes* and *Quarrellings*, were they, when *Faustus Socinus* came into *Poland*, who at length brought them into the *Condition* wherein they are, by the *meanes* and *wayes* that shall be *farther* insisted on.

And this State of things, considering how not unlike the condition of *multitudes* of men is thereunto in these *Nations* wherein we live, hath *often times* made me *fear*, that if *Satan* should put it into the *heart* of any Person of *learning* and *ability*, to serve his

Iust and *Ambition* with *craft*, *wisdome*, and *diligence*, it were not impossible for him to gather the dispersed, and divided *opinionatists* of *our dayes* to a *Consent* in some such *body* of *Religion*, as that which *Socinus* framed for the *Polonians*: But of *him*, his *Person*, and *labours*, by what *ways* and *meanes* he attained his End, it may not be *unacceptable* from his *own*, and *friends* writings to give some *farther* account.

That *Faustus Socinus* of *Sene*, was borne of a *good* and *ancient family*, famous for their *skill* in the *Law*, in the *moneth of December*, in the year 1539, that he *lived* in his own *country*, until he was *about the age* of 20 *yeares*; That then leaving his *Country* after his *Uncle Lælius*, he went to *Leyden*, and lived there *three yeares*, That then *upon* the death of his *Uncle* having got his *books*, he returned into *Italy*, and lived in the Court of the great *Duke of Tuscany* 12 *yeares*, about the close of which time he *wrote* his *book* in *Italian* de *Authoritate Sacræ Scripturæ*; That leaving his *Country* he came to *Basil* in *Switzerland*, and abode there *three* yeares, and somewhat more, are things *commonly known*, and *so little* to *our purpose*, that I shall not insist upon them.

(g) *Illic solidum triennium quod excurrit Theologiæ studio incubuit, paucissimis Lælii Patrui scriptis & pluribus aliis relictis notis multum adjutus est. Vita Fausti Socini.*

All the while he was at *Basil*, and about *Germany*, he kept his *opinions* much to himselfe, being (*g*) intent upon the *Study* of his *Uncle Lælius* his notes, as the *Polonian Gentleman* who wrote his life confesseth: whereunto he added the *Dialogues of Bernardus Ochinus*, as himselfe acknowledgeth, which about that time were turned into Latine by (*h*) *Castellio*, as he professed, to *get money* by his *labour* to live upon: (though (*i*) he pleads that he read *Ochinus* his *Dialogues* in *Poland*, and as it seemes not before) and from *thence* he was esteemed to have taken his *Doctrine* of the *mediation* of Christ.

The Papers of his *Uncle Lælius*, of which himselfe often makes mention, were *principally* his *Comment* upon the *first chapter* of Saint *John*: and some *notes upon sundry Texts of Scripture*, giving

(h) *Bernardini Ochini Dialogos transtuli, non ut judex, sed ut translator; & ex ejusmodi opera ad alendam familiam quæstum facere solitus. Castel. Apol.* (i) *Illud certissimum est, Gregorium Zarnoccium ministrum ut vocant Evangelicum qui nominatim adversus disputationem meam de Jesu Christo Salvatore libellum Polonicè edidit, in ejus præfatione asserit, me ex Ochini dialogis annis ab hinc circiter triginta 5 editis Sententiam illius meæ disputationis accepisse, nam certe in Dialogis illis, quorum non pauca exempla jamdiu in ipsa Polonia mihi videre contigit &c. Faust. Socin. Epist. ad Martinum Vadovitum Acad. Craco. Professorem.*

Testimony to the Deity of Christ; among which *Faustus* extol's that abominable *corruption* of *John* the 8 and the 58. Of which afterwards I shall *speake* at large. (*Socin. Respons. ad Eras. Johan.*) His *Comment* on the first of John (*k*) *Beza* tels us, is the most *depraved* and *corrupt* that ever was *put* forth; it's Authour having *out gone* all that went before him in *depraving* that portion of Scripture.

The Comment it's selfe is *published* by *Junius* (*in defensione sanctæ Trinitatis*) and confuted by him, and *Zanchius*, at large (*de tribus Elohim. lib.* 6. *cap.* 2. *& deinceps*) *Faustus* varying something from his *Uncle* in the carrying on of the *same* designe.

His book *de Jesu Christo Servatore*, he wrote as the *Authour* of his Life assures us, whilest he was *in*, and about *Basil*, as also many *passages* in his *Epistles* and other *writings* manifest.

(*l*) About the year 1575, he began it, which he finished about the yeare 1578, although the book was not *printed* till the year 1594 For upon the *divulging* of *it*, (he then living at *Cracovia*) a *tumult* was raised gainst him by the *unruly* and disorderly *Students*, wherein he was *dragged up* and *down*, and *beaten*, and *hardly* escaped with his Life; which inhumane procedence he *expostulates* at large in an *Epistle* to *Martin Vaidovita* a *Professour* of the *University*, by whose *meanes* he was delivered from being murder'd: but this fel out in the year 1598 as is evident from the date of that *Epistle*, 4 years after the book was printed.

The Book is written against one *Covet*, whom I know by nothing else, but what of his disputes with *Socinus* is by him *published*; *Socinus* confesseth that he was (*m*) *a learned man*; and in repute for

(*k*) *Lælius in Samosateni partes clam transiit; verbo Dei ut ex quodam ejus scripto nunc liquet alcoveteratorie & plane versute depravato, ac præsertim primo Evangelii Johann. capite, ut mihi quidem videatur omnes ejus corruptores superasse, Beza Epist.* 81.

(*l*) *Cum Basiliæ degeret ad annũ usq; 1575 dum lumen sibi exortum, ad alios propogare studet, ab amicis ad alicuius sensim dilapso disserendi Argumento, disputationem de* Jesu Christo *summam manum imposuit: Eques Polon. Vita Socin.* (*m*) *Et sane mirum est cum bonis literis ut audio, & ex sermone quem simul habuimus conjicere, atque ex tuis scriptis potui sis admodum ex cultus re il non vidisse* Socin. de Servatore, *l.* 1, *part.* 1. *c.* 10.

Servatore *ore primùm* inchoatam, *postea scripto* complexus *est*: *cui Anno* 1578 *impositi*: Eques Polon. *Vita Socin.*

Learning. And indeed if we may *take* an *estimate* of the *man*, from the little that is *there* delivered of him, he was a *godly*, *honest*, and very *learned* man, and spake as much in the *Cause* as might be *expected*, or was *needful* before farther *opposition* was *made* to the *truth* he did defend. Of all the books of *him* concerning whom we speak, this his disputation *de Jesu Christo Servatore* is written with the *greatest strength*, *Subtiltye*, and *Plausibility*; neither is any thing

thing sayd *afterwards* by *himselfe*, or the *rest* of his *followers*, that is not *comprized* in it: of this *book* he was wont afterwards to (*n*) *boast*, as *Crellius* informes us, and to say, *that if he might have some excellent Adversary to deale withall upon the point, he then would shew what could farther be spoken of the subject.*

This book at it's *first* comming out, was confuted by *Gregorius Zarnovecius*, (as *Socinus* testifies in his Epistle to *Vajodita*) in the *Polonian language*, which was afterwards *translated* into *latine* by *Conradus Huberus*, and printed at *Franeker*, An. 1618. Also by one *Otho Casmannus*: and thirdly at large by *Sibrandus Lubbertus* Anno 1611: who together with his *refutation*, printed the whole book it's selfe: I hope to no disadvantage of the truth, though a late *Apostate* to *Rome*, whom we called here *Hugh Cressey*; but is lately commenced B. *Serenus* Cressey, a *Priest* of the order of *Benedict*, and who would have been even a *Carthusian*, such high honour did the man *aime* at) tels us, that some of his *Schollars* procured him to doe it, that so they might get the *book* it's selfe in their *hands*: But the book will speak for it's selfe with indifferent Readers, & for it's *clearness* it is extolled by (*p*) *Vossius*: Generally all that have *since written* of that *subject*, in *Theses*, *Commonplaces*, *Lectures*, *Comments*, professed *Controversies*, have made that *book* the ground of their *procedure*.

One is not to be *omitted*, which is in the hands of *all* those who *enquire* into these things, or think that they are *concerned* in the *knowledge* of them: this is *Grotius*, his *Defensio fidei catholicæ De satisfactione Christi, adversus Faustum Socinum Senensem*: Immediatly upon the coming out of *that book*, *Animadversions* were put forth against it, by *Harmannus Ravenspergerus*, approved (as it seemes) by (*q*) our *Doctour Prideaux*.

The *truth* is, those Animadversions of *Ravenspergerus* are *many* of them *slight*, and in sundry things he was mistaken, whereby his *endeavours* were easily eluded by the *learned* (*r*) *Vossius*, in his Vindication of *Grotius* against him: not that the dissertation of *Grotius* is *free* from being *lyable* to *many*, & *just exceptions*, partly in things wherein he was *mistaken*, partly wherin he *failed* in what he undertook; (whereby *many young Students* are deluded, as ere long may be manifested) but that his *Antagonist* had not well *layed* his *Action*, nor did pursue it with any skill.

However the *Interpretations* of Scripture, given *therein* by that *learned*

(*n*) *Audivimus ex iis qui familiariter ipso sunt usi cum significasse, sicut tum jactabatur, excellens sibi si contingeret adversarius, qui librum de Jesu Christo servatore aloriretur, tum demum se totum hoc Argumentum ab origine explicaturum; Crelli: Præfat Respon. ad Grot. pag. 12.*

(*o*) *Exomologesis of Hugh Paulin e Cressey, &c.*

(*p*) *Post luculentas Sibrandi Luberti commentationes adversũ Socinum editas Vos. resp. ad judicium Ravensp.*

(*q*) *In eosdem exercuit stylum ut Socinianismi suspicionem amoliretur Hugo Grotius, sed prævaricantem aliquoties vellicat in censura, Ravenspergerus.* Prideaux lecti: de justificatione

(*r*) *Vossii respon. ad judicium Ravensperger.*

learned man, will rise up in *judgment* against many of the *Annotations*, which in his after-*comments* on the *scripture* hee hath *divulged*. His booke was at length answered by *Crellius*, the successor of *Valentinus Smalcius* in the *schoole* and society of *Racovia*; after which *Grotius* lived *above* 20 yeares, and never *attempted* any reply. Hereupon it *has* beene *generally* concluded, that the man was wrought over to drinke in that, which hee had before published to be the *most destructive poyson* of the *church*; the beliefe whereof was *exceedingly encreased* and cherished by an *Epistle* of his to *Crellius*, who had *subtilly* managed the *man*, according to his desire of *honour*, and regard, and by his *Annotations* of which wee shall have cause to speake afterwards. That booke of *Crellius* has since beene at large confuted by (*f*) *Essenius*, and enervated by a *learned* and *ingenuous* Author in his *specimen refutationis Crellii de Satisfactione Christi*; published about the same time, with the well *deserving labour* of *Essenius*, in the yeare 1648.

Præsentissimum ecclesiæ venenum.

(*f*) *Triumphus Crucis Autore And: Essen.*

Most of the *Arguments* and *sophismes* of *Socinus* about this businesse are *refuted*, and dissolved by *David Paræus*, in his comment on the *Romans*, not mentioning the name of him, whose *objections* they were.

About the yeare 1608 *Michael Gitichius* gathered together the *summe* of what is *argumentative* in that booke of *Socinus*, against the satisfaction of Christ, which was *answered* by (*t*) *Ludovicus Lucius* professor then at *Amburgh*, and the *reply* of *Gitichius confuted*, and removed out of the way by the same hand. In that briefe rescript of *Lucius*, there is a cleare attempt to the enervating of the whole *booke* of *Socinus*, and that with good successe by way of a *Logicall* and *Scholasticall* procedure. Only I cannot but professe my *Sorrow*, that having in his *first answer* laid that *solid foundation* of the *necessity* of the *satisfaction* of Christ from the eternall nature, and justice of God, whereby it is absolutely impossible, that upon the consideration and supposition of *sinne committed*, it should be *pardoned* without a due compensation; In his *rejoynder* to the reply of *Gitichius*, hee *closes* with a commonly knowne expression of *Augustine*. (*u*) That *God could, if hee would, have delivered us without satisfaction, but he would not.* So casting downe the most *stable* and *unmoveable* Pillar of that *Doctrine*, which hee so *dextrously* built up, in spight of its Adversaries.

(*t*) *de gravissima Quæstione utrum Christus pro peccatis nostris justitiæ divinæ satisfecerit necne? scholastica disputatio.*

(*u*) *Gitichio itaque de absolutâ dei potentiâ cujus potestate (de qua nulla nobis dubitatio) ineniter blateranti, elegantissimis Augustini verbis respondeo, Omnia Deus potuit si voluisset &c. Lucius ad Gitich: p. 110.*

I dare boldly acquaint the *younger ſtudents* in theſe weighty points of the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, that the Truth of this one *particular*, concerning the *eternall Juſtice of God, indeſpenſably requiring* the puniſhment of ſinne, being well eſtabliſhed, (For which end they have not *only* the conſent, but the *Arguments* of *almoſt* all, who have handled theſe controverſies with *skill* and *ſucceſſe*,) will ſecurely carry them them through all the *ſophiſmes* of the *Adverſaries*, and cut all the *knotts*, which with ſo much *ſubtilty* they endeavour to *tye*, and *caſt* upon the *doctrine* of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, as I have in part (*w*) elſe where demonſtrated; From this booke did alſo *Smalcius* take the *whole* of what hee has delivered about the *death of* Chriſt in his *Racovian Catechiſme*, not adding any thing at all of his owne; which Catechiſme as it was heretofore confuted by *Fredericke Bauldwinus*, by order of the *Univerſity of Wittenburgh*, and is by ſeverall *parcells* by many *removed* out of the way, eſpecially by *Altingius*, and *Maccovius*, ſo of late it is wholy anſwered by (*x*) *Nicholaus Arnoldus*, now *Profeſſor* at *Franeker*, which comeing lately to my *hands* prevented mee from proceeding to a juſt *orderly Refutation* of the *whole*, as I was intended to do, Although I hope the reader will not find any thing of *importance therein omitted*.

(*w*) *Diatrib: de juſtit: Divin: Vind.*

(*x*) *Religio Sociniana refutata.*

To cloſe the ſtory of *this* booke of *Socinus*, and the *progreſſe* it hath made in the world; This I dare aſſure *them*, who are leſſe *exerciſed* in theſe *ſtudies*, that *though* the *whole* of the Treatiſe have at firſt *view* a very plauſible *pretence* and *appearance*, yet there is a *line* of *ſophiſtry* running through it, which being *once* diſcovered, (as indeed it may be eaſily *felt*) with the help of ſome *few principles*, the whole *fabricke* of it will *fall* to the *ground*, and appeare as *weake* and *contemptible* a *peice*, as any we have to *deale* withall in that *warfare*, which is to be undertaken for the *Truths* of the Goſpell. This alſo I cannot *omit*, as to the *riſe* of this Abomination of denying the *ſatisfaction* of Chriſt; that as it *ſeemes* to have been firſt *invented* by the *Pelagians*, ſo in after *Ages*, it was *vented* by *Petrus* Abailardus, *profeſſor of Philoſophy at Paris*; of whom *Bernard*, who wrote againſt him, ſaith; *Habemus in Francia novum de vetere magiſtro Theologum, qui ab incunte ætate ſuâ in arte luſit dialecticâ, & nunc in ſcripturis ſanctis inſanit.* And in his (*y*) Epiſtle (which is to *Pope Innocent*,) about him, he ſtrongly confutes his *imaginations* about this very buſi-

(*y*) *Bernard: Epiſt: 190.*

neſſe

nesse, whereupon he was *condemned* in a (z) *Councell* at *Rome*, held by the same *Innocent*.

(z) *Baron: ad Ann: 1140.*

This *part* of our faith, being of so great weight and *importance*, the great *basis* and foundation of the *Church*, you will find it at large *insisted* on, and vindicated, in the ensueing Treatise.

The (a) *Author* of the *life* of *Socinus* tels us (as hee himselfe also gives in the information) that whilest he *abode* about *Switzerland*, at *Basill*, and *Tiguri*, he had a *dispute* with *Puccius*, which also is since published; *this* was before his going into *Poland*, in the yeare. 1578.

(a) *Aliam interim cũ Francisco Puccio ineunte. an: 1578. Tiguri confecit.*

The story of this *Puccius*, because it may be of some use, as to the *present estate* of the *minds* of many in the things of God, I shall briefly give from *Socinus* himselfe; (Epist. 3. ad *Math: Radec*:) and that as a *tremendous example* of the righteous judgment of God, *giving up* a person of *a light unstable* spirit to fearfull *delusions*, with a desperate issue: *Originally* he was a *merchant*, of a *good* and *noble* family: but leaving his *profession*, he betooke himselfe to *study*, and for his *advantage* therein came hither to (c) *Oxford*. After he had *stayed* here untill he began to *vent* some *paradoxes* in Religion, about the yeare. 1565. (being not able *here* to prevaile with any to close with him) he went to *Basill*; where there was a dispute betweene him, and *Socinus* before mentioned; in the *issue* whereof, they both *professed*, that they could agree in *nothing* in Religion, but, that there *was a God* that made the world. At *Basill* he maintained *universall Redemption*, and a *naturall faith*, as they then termed it: or an *innate power of believing* without the *efficacy* of the grace of God; for which he was *compeld thence* to depart; which doing he returned againe into *England*; where, upon the *same account he was* cast into *prison* for a season; thence being released, he went into *Holland*; from whence by *letters* he challenged *Socinus* to dispute, and went 1000 miles (viz: to *Cracovia* in *Poland*) afterward, to make it good. After some *disputes* there, (both *parties condescending* to them on very *ridiculous conditions*,) *Socinus* seeming to prevaile, by having *most friends among the judges*, as the other professed, he stayed there a while, and wrote a *booke*, which he stiled the *shut bible*, and of *Elias*: wherein he laboured to deny all *ordinances*, *ministry*, and *preaching*, untill *Elias* should come and *restore all things*. His reason was *taken* from the *defe-*

Vita Fausti Socin:

(b) *ex nobili admodum familiâ, quæ etiam tres Cardinales habuit, natus. mercaturâ relicta se totum sacrarum literarum studio tradidit.*

(c) *quod ut cõmodius facere posset in Angliam se contulit, ibique in Oxoniensi Gymnasio aliquandiu se exercuit. &c.*

ction and *Apoſtacy* of the church, wherein (ſaid he) all truth and Order was loſt, the ſtate of the *church* being not againe to be recovered, unleſſe ſome with *Apoſtolicall Authority*, and power of working miracles were immediatly ſent of God for that purpoſe. How farre this *perſwaſion* hath prevailed with ſome in our daies, wee all *know* and lament. *Puccius* at length begins to *fancy*, that *he* ſhall himſelfe be imployed in this great *Reſtauration*, that is to be made of the church by immediate *miſſion* from God. Whileſt he was in Expectation of his *call* hereunto, there comes two *Engliſh men* into *Poland*: men pretending *diſcourſe* with *Angels* and *Revelations* from God; *one* of them was the chiefe at Revelations (their names I cannot learne) the *other* gave out what *he* received, in his *daiely* converſe with *Angels*, and *words* he heard from God about the deſtruction of all the *preſent frame* of the *worſhip of God*: To theſe men *Puccius* joyned himſelfe, and followed them to *Prague* in *Bohemia*, though his friends dealt with him to the *contrary*, *aſſuring* him, that one of his companions was a *Mountebanke*, and the other a *Magitian*; but being full of his *former perſwaſions*, of the *ceaſing* of all *Ordinances* and inſtitutions, with the neceſſity of their *Reſtitution* by immediate *Revelation* from God, having got *companions* fit to *harden* him in his *folly* and preſumption, he ſcorned all *adviſe* and away he went to *Prague*: no ſooner came he *thither*, but his *Prophet* had a *Revelation* by an *Angel*, that *Puccius* muſt become *Papiſt*; his cheating companion having never beene *otherwiſe*. Accordingly he turnes *Papiſt*, beggs *pardon publickly* for his deſerting the *Romane church*, is *reconciled* by a Prieſt: in whoſe ſociety after he had a while *continued*, and laboured to *pervert others* to the ſame *ſuperſtition* with himſelfe, he dyed a *deſperate magitian*. Have none in our daies beene led in the like *maze*? hath not *Sathan* led ſome in the ſame *circle*, ſetting out from *ſuperſtition* to *profaneneſſe*, paſſing through ſome *zeale* and *earneſtneſſe* in Religion, riſing to a contempt of *miniſtry* and *ordinances*, with an expectation of *Revelations*, and *communion with Angels*? And how many have againe ſunke downe into *Popery*, *Atheiſme*, and *horrible abominations*, is knowne to *all* in this nation, who thinke it their *duty* to enquire into the *things* of God. I have given this inſtance, only to *manifeſt* that the *old enemy* of our ſalvation is not *playing* any *new game* of *deceit* and *Temptation*, but ſuch as he hath *ſucceſſefully*

cessfully acted in former *generations.* Let not us be ignorant of his deceits.

By the way a little further to *take* in the consideration of *men* like *minded* with him, last mention'd. Of those who denyed all *Ordinances*, and maintained such an utter *losse*, and *defection* of all *Church State*, and Order, that it was *impossible* it should be restored without *new Apostles*, evidencing their *ministry* by *miracles*, this was commonly the issue; that being *pressed* with *this*, that there was nothing *needful* to constitute a *Church* of Christ, but that there were a *company of men* believing in *Jesus Christ*, receiving the *word of God*, and taking it for their Rule; They denyed that indeed *now* there *was*, or *could be* any *faith* in *Jesus Christ*, the *Ministers* that should *beget* it being utterly *ceased*: and *therefore* it was *advisable* for *men* to *serve God*, to *live justly*, and *honestly*, according to the *dictates of the law of nature*, and to *omit* all *thoughts* of *Christ*, beyond an expectation of his *sending Persons* hereafter, to acquaint the World *againe* with his worship.

That this was the judgment of (*t*) Math: Radecius his *honoured* friend, *Socinus* informes us: though he mollifies his *expression*, (*pag.* 123.) ascribing it to others: Whether *many* in our daies are not *insensibly fallen* into the same Abominations a little *time* will discover. The maine of the *plea* of the men of this *perswasion* in those dayes, was taken from the *Example* of the *Israelites* under that *Idolatrous* Apostacy, wherein they were *engaged* by *Jeroboam*. In the dayes of *Elijah* there were (said they) 7000 who joyned not with the *residue* in their *false* worship and *Idolatry*; but yet they *never went* about to *gather*, *constitute*, and set up a new *Church*, or *Churches*; but *remained* in their *scattered* condition, keeping *themselves* as they *could* from the *Abominations* of their brethren: not considering that there is not the *same Reason* of the *Judaical*, and *Christian Churches*: in that the carrying on of the *worship of God* among them, was annex'd to *one* Tribe, yea to *one* Family in that *Tribe* chiefly, tyed to *one* certain place, no publicke *institutted worship*, such as was to be the bond of *communion* for the Church, being *acceptable*, that was not performed by *those Persons*, in *that* place. So that it was *utterly impossible* for the *godly* in *Israel* then, or the *ten* Tribes to set up a *new Church* state, seeing they neither had the *Persons*, nor were possessed of the *place*, without which no such *constitution* was *acceptable* to God: as being

(*t*) *Epist ad Radec.* 3. *pag.* 87. 119.

not of his *appointment*. Under the *Gospel* it is not so; neither as to the *one*, or *other*. All *places* being now *alike*, and all *Persons* who are *inabled* thereunto, having *liberty* to preach the *Word*, in the *Order* by Christ appointed, the *erecting* of *Churches*, and the *celebration* of *ordinances*, is *recoverable* according to the mind of God, out of the *greatest defection imaginable*, whil'st unto any *Persons* there is a *continuance* of the *Word* and *Spirit*.

But to proceed with *Socinus*. *Blandrata* having got a great *interest* in the *King* of *Poland*, and *Prince* of *Transylvania*, as hath been *declared*, and making it his *businesse* to promote the *Antitrinitarians*, of what sort *soever*, being in *Transilvania*, where the men of his own Abomination were exceedingly *divided* about the *Invocation* and *Adoration* of *Jesus Christ*, *Franciscus David* carrying all before him, in an *opposition* therunto, (of which whole *business* I shall give a farther account afterwards) he sends for (*d*) *Socinus*, who was *known* to them, and from his dealing with *Pucccius* began to be *famed* for a *Disputant*, to come to him into *Transilvania*, to dispute with, and confute *Franciscus David*, in the end of the year 1578. where what successe his *dispute* had, in the *imprisonment* and *death* of *David*, shall be afterwards related.

(*d*) *Multum illa tempestate turbarum dederat Transilvanicis Ecclesiis Francisci Davidis & reliquorum de honore ac potestate Christi opinio; cui malo remedium quærens* Georgius Blandrata Socinũ *Basiliæ evocavit (Anno 1578) Ut præcipuum factionis ducem Franciscum Davidem, à tam turpi & pernicioso errore abstraheret: vita Faust. Socin.*

Being now fallen upon this *controversy*, which *fell* out before *Faustus* his going into *Poland*, before I proceed to his *worke* and business there, I shall give a brief account of this *businesse* which I have now *mentioned*, and on which occasion he was sent for by *Blandrata* into *Poland*: referring the most considerable *disputes* he had about that *difference* to that *place* in the *ensuing Treatise*, where I shall treat of the *Invocation* and *Worship* of Christ.

After *way* was once made in the *minds* of men, for the *further* work of *Sathan*, by denying the *Deity* of our *blessed Lord Jesus*: very many quickly grew to have more *contemptible* thoughts of him, then those seemed to be *willing* they should, from whose *principles* they professed (and indeed righteously) that their *meane esteeme* of *him* did arise. Hence *Franciscus David*, *Georgius Enjedinus*, *Christianus Franken*, and sundry *others*, denyed that Christ was to be *Worshipped*, with Reliligious worship, or that he might be *Invocated*, and *called* upon. Against these *Socinus* indeed *contended* with all his might, professing that he would not account such as *Christians*, who would not allow that Christ

might

might be *Invocated*, and *was* to be *worshipped*: which that he *was* to be, he proved by *undenyable Testimonies* of Scripture. But yet when *himselfe* came to answer their *Arguments*, whereby they *endeavoured* to *prove*, that a meere man (such as on *both sides* they acknowledged Christ to be) might not be *worshiped* with *religious worship*, or *divine Adoration*, the *man* with all his *craft*, and *subtilties* was *intangled*, utterly confounded, *silenced*, *slaine* with his owne *weapons*, and *triumphed* over, as I shall afterwards manifest, in the account which I shall give of the *disputation* between *him* and *Christianus Franken* about this business. God in his *righteous judgment* so ordering things, that *he* who would not *imbrace the truth*, which he ought to have received, should not be *able* to *maintaine* and defend that *Truth* which he did *receive*: For having what in him lay'd, *digg'd up* the only *foundation* of the *Religious* worship and *Adoration* of *Christ*, he was altogether *unable* to keep the *building* upright: Nor did this fall out for want of *ability* in the *man*, no man under heaven being able on his *false Hypothesis*, to maintaine the *worship* of Christ, but (as was said) meerely by the *just hand of God*, giving him up to be *punished* by his own *errours* and *darknesse*.

Being hardened in the *contempt of Christ* by the *successe* they had against *Socinus* and his followers, with whom they *conversed* and *disputed*, some of the *men*, before mentioned, stayed not *with him* at the affirming of him to be a *meere* man, nor yet where they began, *building* on that *supposition*, that he *was not to be worshipped*, but proceeded yet *farther*, & affirmed, that he was indeed a *good man*, and sent *of God*, but yet he *spake* not by the *spirit of prophesy*, but so, as that whatever was *spoken by him*, and written by his Apostles, was to be *examined* by *Moses* and the Prophets, whereto if it did not *agree*, it was to be *rejected*: which was the summe of the (*e*) *First* and second *Theses* of *Franciscus David*, in opposition to which (*f*) *Socinus* gave in his judgment in certaine

(*e*) *Homo ille Jes. Nazarcus qui Christus appellatur, non per spiritum propheticum, sed per Spiritum Sanctum locutus est; i. e. est quamvis à Deo legatus fuerit, non tamen quæcunq; verba ex ipsius Dei ore provenisse censenda sunt: 2 Hinc fit ut illius & Apostolorum ejus verba, ad Mosaicæ legis & aliorum propheticorum oraculorum normam expendenda sint, & siquid contrarium vel diversum ab his in illis reperiatur, aut reperiri videtur, id aut rejiciendum, aut certe ita interpretandum sit, ut cum Mosis & Prophetarum doctrina consentiat quæ sola morum & divini cultus regula est.* (*f*) *Theses quibus Franciscus Davidis sententia de Christi munere explicatur una cum antithesibus Ecclesiæ à Socino conscriptis, & illustrissimo Transilvaniæ Principi Christophoro Barthoræo oblatis.*

Antitheses

Antitheses to *Christopher Barthoræus*, Prince of *Transylvania*; who had then cast *David* into prison for his blasphemy.

To give a little *account* by the *way*, of the end of this *man*, with his contempt of the *Lord Jesus*.

In (*g*) the yeare 1579 in the *beginning* of the moneth of *June*, he was cast into *prison* by the *Prince* of *Transylvania*, and lived until the end of *November*: That he was cast into prison by the *instigation* of *Socinus* himselfe and *Blandrata*, the Testimonies are beyond exception; for this is not only recorded by *Bellarmine* and others of the Papists, to whose Assertions concerning any *Adversary* with whom they have to doe, I confess *much credit* is not to be given, but by others also of *unquestionable Authority*. (*h*) This indeed (*i*) *Socinus* denies, and would willingly impose the *Odium* of it upon others: but the truth is, considering the *keenesse* and *wrath* of the man's *spirit*, and the (*k*) thoughts he had of this *miserable wretch*, it is more then probable, that he was *instrumental* towards his death. The like Apologie does (*l*) *Smalcius* make in his answer to *Franzius* about the *carriage* of the *Samosatenians* in that businesse of *Franciscus David*, where they accused one *another* of *Craft*, *Treachery*, *bloody cruelty*, *treason*. Being cast into *prison* the *miserable creature* fell into a (*m*) *Phrenetical* distemper through the *revenging hand* of God upon him, as *Socinus* confesseth himselfe. (*n*) In this *miserable condition* the *Divel* (saith the *Historian*) *appeared unto him*; whereupon he cryed out, *behold who expect* me their Companion in my journey: whether *really*, or in his *vexed* distempered

(*g*) *Certum est illum in ipso initio mensis Junii carceri inclusum fuisse, & vixisse usq; ad mensem Novembris, nisi vehementer fallor, quo extinctus, est Socin. ad Wick. cap. 2. pag. 44.*

(*h*) *Illud vero notandum, quod procurantibus Georgio Blandrata & Fausto Socino, in Transylvania exulibus, Franciscus David morti traditus fuit. Adrian. Regen. Histo. Eccles.* Slavonica *lib. 1. pag. 90.*

(*i*) *Quod si Wickus intelligit damnandi verbo nostros ministros censuisse illum aliquâ pœna afficiendum, aut vult fallere, aut egregiè fallitur: nam certum est, in judicio illo, cum minister quidam* Calvinianus *Christophero Principi, qui toti actioni interfuit, & præfuit, satis longa oratione persuasisset, ut talem hominem è medio tolleret, minitans iram Dei nisi id feciset, ministros nostros proprius ad ipsum principem accedentes, reverenter illi supplicasse, ut miseri hominis misereri vellet, & clementem & benignum se erga illum præbere. Socin ad Wiekum: cap. 2 pag. 47.*

(*k*) *Imo plusquam hæreticum cum (Ecclesiæ nostræ) judicaverunt, nam talem hominem indignum Christiano nomine esse dixerunt; quippe qui Christo invocationis cultum prorsus detrahendo, & eum curam Ecclesiæ gerere negando, simul ipsâ negaret cum esse Christum. idem ubi supra.*

(*l*) *Exemplum denique affert nostrorum (Thes. 108) quomodo se gesserint in Transylvania, in negotio Francisci Davidis: quomodo semetipsos in actu illo inter se reos agant* vafriciæ, *crudelitatis sanguinariæ, proditionis, &c. Smalcius. Refuta. Thes. de Hypocrit. disput. 9. pag. 298.*

(*m*) *De Phrenesi ista in quam incederit, aliquid sane auditum est, non tantum biduo ante mortem sed pluribus diebus. Socin. ubi supra.* (*n*) *Ecce qui me comitem itineris expectant. Flor. Remund lib. 4. cap. 12.*

imagination

imagination, disordered by his despairing mind, I determine *not*: but most certaine it is, that in *that* condition he expired: not (o) in the year 1580, as *Bellarmine*, *Weike*, *Ræmundus*, and some of *ours* from them, informe us, but *one year* sooner, as he assures us who best knew. And the consideration of this man's desperate Apostacy and his *Companions*, might be one cause that about *this* time, sundry of the *Antitrinitarians* were converted; amongst whom was (p) *Daniel Bielenscius* a man afterwards of *good* esteem.

But neither yet did *Sathan stoppe* here; but improved the Advantage given him by these men, to the utter *denying* of *Jesus Christ*: For unto the principle of Christ's being *not* God, adding another of the same *nature*, that the *prophesies* of the old *Testament* were all concerning *temporal* things, some amongst them at length concluded, that there was no *promise* of any such *person* as *Jesus Christ* in the whole *Old Testament*. That the *Messiah* or *King* promised, was only a *King* promised to the *Jewes*, that they should *have* after the *captivity*, in case they did not *offend*, but walke with God. (q) The kingdome (say they) *promised in the Old Testament, is a Kingdome of this world only: but the Kingdome which you assert to belong to Jesus of Nazereth, was a kingdome not of this world, an heavenly Kingdome, and so consequently not promised of God, nor from God*: and therefore with *him* they would not have ought to doe. This was the *Argument* of *Martin Seidelius*, *in his Epistle to Socinus and his companions*.

What advantage is given to the like *blasphemous imaginations* with this, by such *Judaizing* Annotations on the *Old Testament* as those of *Grotius*, time will evidence. Now because this man's *Creed* is such, as is not to be *paraleld*; perhaps some may be *contented* to take it in his *own words*, which are as followeth.

(o) *Manifeste in eo sunt decepti, qui hoc Anno 1580, accidisse scribunt, cum certissimum sit ea facta fuisse uno anno ante, hoc est, Anno 1579: Socinus: ad Weik pag. 44.*

(p) *Duces hujus agminis Anabaptistici, & Antitrinitarii erant Gregorius Paulus, Daniel Bielenscius, & alii, quorum tandem aliqui pharisaico proposito relicto, ad Ecclesiam Evangelicam redierunt. ut Daniel Bielenscius, qui Cracoviæ omnium suorum errorum publice pœnitentiam egit, ibidemq; Ecclesiæ Dei commode præfuit: Adrian. Regenvol. Histor. Ecclesiæ Slavonica. lib. 1. pag. 90.* (q) *Ita Argumentor, quoties regnum Davidi usque in seculum promissum est, tale necesse fuit, ut posteri ejus, in quibus hæc promissio impleri debebat, haberent non cœleste sed regnum mundanum Davidi usque in seculum promissum est, ergo regnum mundanum posteri Davidis ut haberent necesse est: & per consequens, Rex ille, quem Prophetæ ex hac promissione post captivitatem Babylonicam regnaturum promiserunt, perinde ut cæteri posteri Davidis, mundanum regnum debuit habere. Quod quia Jesus ille non habuit, non enim regnavit ut David, & posteri ejus, sed dicitur habere cœleste regnum, quod est diversum à mundano regno, ergo Jesus ille non est Rex, quem Prophetæ promiserunt. Martin. Seidelius Epist. 1. ad Socinum.*

Caterum ut scitais cujus sim religionis, quamvis id scripto meo quod habetis, ostenderim, tamen hic breviter repetam. Et primum quidem doctrina de Messia, seu rege illo promisso, ad meam religionem nihil pertinet: nam Rex ille tantum Judæis promissus erat, sicut & bona illa Canaan. Sic etiam circumcisio sacrificia, & reliquæ ceremoniæ Mosis ad me non pertinent, sed tantum populo Judaico promissa, data, & mandata sunt. Neque ista fuerunt cultus Dei apud Judæos, sed inserviebant cultui divino, & ad cultum divinum deducebant Judæos. Verus autem cultus Dei quem meam religionem appello, est Decalogus: qui est æterna, & immutabilis voluntas Dei; qui Decalogus ideo ad me pertinet, quia etiam mihi à Deo datus est, non quidem per vocem sonantem de cœlo, sicut populo Judaico, at per creationem insita est menti meæ; quia autem insitus Decalogus, per corruptionem naturæ humanæ, & pravis consuetudinibus, aliquâ ex parte obscuratus est, ideo ad illustrandum eum, adhibeo vocalem decalogum, qui vocalis decalogus, ideo etiam ad me, & ad omnes populos pertinet, quia cum insito nobis decalogo consentit, imò idem ille decalogus est. Hæc est mea sententia de Messia, seu rege illo promisso, & hæc est mea religio, quam coram vobis ingenuè profiteor: Martin. Seidelius Olavienſis Silesius.

To this issue did *Sathan* drive the *Socinian* principles, in this *man* and sundry others: Even to a *full* and *peremptory* denyal of the *Lord* that *bought* them. In answering this man, it fell out with *Socinus* much as it did *with him* in his disputation with *Franken*, about the adoration, and Invocation of Jesus Christ; for granting *Franken* that Christ was but a mere man, he could no way evade his inference thence, that he was not to be *Invocated*: So granting *Seidelius*, that the *promises* of the *Old Testament* were all *temporal*: He could not maintaine against him, that Jesus Christ whose Kingdome is *heavenly*, was *the King and Messias* therein promised: For (*r*) *Faustus* hath nothing to reply, but that *God gives* more then he *promised*, of which no man ought to complaine; not observing that the Question *being* not about the *faithfulnesse* of God in his promises, but about the *thing promised*, he gave away the whole *Cause*, and yeelded that Christ was not *indeed the King and Messiah promised* in the Old Testament.

Of an alike opinion to this of *Seidelius*, was *he* of whom we spake before, *Franciscus David*: who as to the *Kingdome* of Christ, delivered himselfe to this purpose. That he was appointed

(*r*) *Nam quod dicimus, si Deus mundanum regem mundanumq; regnum promisit, cœlestem autem regem, cœleste regnum reipsa præstitit plus eum præstitisse quam promiserit, rectè omnino dicimus, nam qui plus præstat quam promisit, suis promissis non modo non stetisse sed ea etiam cumulate præstitisse est agnoscendus. Socin. Epist. ad Seidelium pa. 20.*

pointed to be a *King* of the *Jewes*, and that God *sent* him into the *world* to *receive* his kingdome, which was to be *earthly* and *civil*, as the Kingdomes of other Kings: but the *Jewes* rejected him, and *slew* him, contrary to the *purpose* of God, who therefore *took him* from them, and *placed him* in a *quiet place*, where he is not at all *concerned* in any of the *things* of the Church, but is there in *God's designe* a King, and he *will* one day send him againe to *Hierusalem*, there to take upon him a Kingdome, and to *rule* as the *Kings* of this World *doe*, or *have* done (*Thes. Francisci David. de adorat Jes. Christi.*)

The reminding of these Abominations, gives occasion by the way to complaine of the *carnal Apprehensions* of a *Kingdome* of Christ, which too *many* amongst our selves have filled their *thoughts* and Expectations withal. For my *part*, I am *perswaded* that before the *End* of the *World*, the Lord Jesus by his *Word*, and *Spirit*, will multiply the *seed of Abraham* as the *starres of heaven*, bringing into one *fold* the *remnant of Israel*, and the *multitude of the Gentiles*, and that his *Church* shall have *peace* after he hath *judged* & broken the *stubborne* Adversaries thereof, and laid the *Kingdomes* of the *nations* in an *useful subserviency to his interest* in this world: And that *himselfe* will raigne most *gloriously*, by a *Spirit of Light*, *Truth*, *Love*, and *holinesse* in the middest of them. But that he hath a *Kingdome* of *another nature* and *kind* to set *up* in the *World*, then that *heavenly Kingdome* which he hath *peculiarly* exercised ever since he was *exalted*, and made a *Ruler* and a Saviour, that he *should set up a dominion* over men, as *men*, and Rule either *himselfe present*, or by his *Substitutes*, as in a *Kingdome* of this *World*, which is a Kingdome neither of *Grace*, nor *Glory:* I know it cannot be *asserted*, without either the *denyal* of his *Kingdome* for the *present*, or that he is, or *hitherto* hath been a *King*, which was the blasphemy of *Franciscus David* before mentioned; or the *affirming* that he *hath*, or *is* to have upon the promise of *God two Kingdomes* of several sorts, of which in the *whole Word* of God there is not the least Tittle.

To returne; about the *end of* the year 1579. *Faustus Socinus* left (*s*) *Transilvania*, and went into *Poland*, which he chose for the *stage* whereon to *act* his designe. In what *Estate* and *condition* the Persons in *Poland*, and *Lithuania* were, who had fallen off from the *Faith of the Holy Trinity*, was before declared

(*s*) *Anno* 1515. *jam quadragenarius migravit in Poloniam. vita Faust. Socin.*

True (t) it is, that before the coming of *Socinus*, *Blandrata* by the helpe of *Franciscus David* had brought over many of them from *Sabellianisme* and *Tritheisme*, and *Arianisme* unto *Samosatenianisme*, and a full plaine denial of the *Deity* of Christ.

But yet, with that *Pelagian Doctrine*, that *Socinus* came *furnisht* withal unto them, they were utterly unacquainted; and were at no small *difference* many of them about the *Deity*. The condition of the *first man* to be *mortal*, and obnoxious to death, that there was *no original sinne*, that Christ was not an *High Priest* on the earth, that he made no *satisfaction* for sinne, that we are not *justified by his righteousnesse*, but our own, that the *wicked* shall be *utterly consumed* & *annihilated* at the last day, with the rest of his *opinions*, which afterwards he *divulged*, they were utterly *Strangers* unto: as is evident from the contests he had about these things with some of them in their *Synods*, and by writing, especially with *Niemojevius* one of the cheif *Patrons* of their Sect.

In this *condition* of affaires the man being *wise* and *subtile*, obtained his purpose by the ensuing Course of Proceedure.

1. He *joyned* himselfe to *none* of their *Societies*, because being *devided* amongst themselves, he knew that by *adhering* to any *one* professedly, he should *engage* all the *rest* against him. That which he *pretended* most to *favour*, and for whose *sake* he underwent some *contests*, was the *assembly* at *Racovia*, which at first was collected by *Gregorius Paulus*, as hath been *declared*.

From these his *pretence* of abstaining, was, their *rigid injunction* of all to be *rebaptized*, that entered into their fellowship, and communion. But he who *made* it his designe to gather the *scattered Antitrinitarians* into a *body*, and a consistency in a Religion among themselves, saw *plainly*, that the *rigid* insisting upon *Anabaptisme*, which was the *first principle* of some of them, would certainly keep them at an *unreconcileable* distance. Wherefore he fals upon an *opinion* much *better* suited to his *designe*, and maintained, that *baptisme* was only *instituted* for the *initiation of them*, who from *any other false* Religion were turned to the *Religion* of Christ; but that it *belonged* not to *Christian Societies*, or to *them* that were *borne of Christian parents*, and had never been of any other *profession* or Religion, though they *might* use it, if they pleased, as an *indifferent* thing. And therefore he refused to joyne *himselfe* with the *Racovians*, unless upon this *Principle*, that they would

(t) *Extat apud me ipsius Blandratæ Epistola, non tamen scripta sine Thesco (Statorio) si Blandratam bene novi, in qua Gregorium Paulum à Tritheismo ad Samosateni dogma revocare nititur. Incidit enim Blandrata in Transylvaniam rediens in quendam Franciscum David, paulo magis, quam superiores illi ut aiunt providum: Beza Epist. 81.*

would *desist* for the *time* to come, from requiring any to be *baptized* that should joyne with them; In a *short* time he devided that *meeting* by this opinion, and at *length* utterly *dissolved* them, as to their *old* principles they first consented *into*; and built the *remainder* of them by the hand of *Valentinus Smalcius* into his *owne mould* and frame.

The Author (*u*) of his *life* sets it forth, as a *great tryall* of his *prudence*, *piety*, and *patience*, that he was *repulsed* from the society at *Racovia*, and that with *ignominy*: when the *truth is*, he *absolutely* refused to joyne with them, unlesse they would at once *renounce* their owne *principles*, and subscribe to his, which is as *hard* a condition as can be put upon any *perfectly conquered enemy*. This himselfe delivers at large on sundry *occasions*, especially insisting on and debating that businesse in his Epistles to *Simon Rosenbergius*, and to *Sophia Siemichovia*. On this *score* did he write his disputation *de baptismo aquæ*, with the vindication of it from the animadversions of *A: D.* whom I suppose to be *Andreus Dudithius*, and of *M: C.* endevouring with all his *strength* to prove that *baptisme* is not an ordinance appointed for the *use* of Christians, or their *Children*, but only such as were converted from *Paganisme*, or *Mahumedisme*: and this he did in the yeare 1580, two yeares after his coming into *Poland*, as he declares by the date of the disputation from *Cracovia* at the close thereof. And in this *perswasion* he was so *fixed*, and laid such *weight* upon it, that after he had once before *broken* the assembly at *Racovia*, in his *old* daies he encourages (*w*) *Valentinus Smalcius*, then their *teacher*, to *breake* them againe, becaus some of them *tenaciously* held their opinon; and for those, who as *Smalcius* inform'd him would thereupon fall off to the *Reformed Churches*, he bids them *go*, and *a good riddance* of them. By this meanes (I say) he utterly *broke up*, and devided, and dissolved the meeting at *Racovia*, which was collected upon the *principles* before mentioned, that

(*u*) *Ecclesiis Polonicis, quæ solum patrem domini Jesu summum Deum agnoscunt, publicè adjungi ambivit, sed satis acerbe aliquandiu repulsam passus est, quâ tamen ignominiâ nihil minimè accensus, vir, non tam indole quam animi instituto, ad patientiam compositus, nulla unquam alienati animi vestigia dedit: vita Fausti Socini.*

(*w*) *Nam quod mihi objicis me communionem cum fratribus, & Christi fidelibus spernere, nec curare ut cum ipsis eandem dominicæ celebrem, respondeo, me tostquam in Pol-*

niam veni, nihil antiquius *habuisse, quam ut me quam maxime fratribus conjungerem, licet invenissem illos in non parvis religionis nostræ capitibus, à me diversam sentire; quemadmodum multi hodieque sentiunt: quod si nihilominus aquæ baptismum unà cum illis non accipio hoc præterea fit, quia id bonâ conscientiâ facere nequeo, nisi publicè ante protestor, me non quod censeam baptismum aquæ mihi meique similibus, ullo modo necessarium esse, &c.* Epist: ad *Sophiam Siemichoviam, fœminam nobilem.* Epistol: 11. ad *Valentinum Smalcium* Ann: 1604.

there remained none abiding to their first engagement, but *a few old women*, as (*x*) *Squarcialupus* tels him, and as himselfe confesses in his answer for them to (*y*) *Palæologus*. By this course of *behaviour*, the man had these two *Advantages*: 1. he *kept faire* with all *parties* amongst them, and provoked not *any* by joyning with *them*, with *whom* they could not agree; so that all *parties* looked on him as their *owne*, and were ready to make him the *umpire* of all their differences, by which he had no small advantage of working them all to his owne principles.

Secondly, he was lesse exposed to the *fury* of the *Papists*, which he *greatly* feared, (*loving* well the things of this world) then he *would* have been, had he *joyned* himselfe to any *visible church* profession. And indeed his *privacy* of *living*, was a great means of his security.

Secondly, His *second* great *Advantage was*, that he was a *schollar*, and was *able* to defend and *countenance* them against their *oppossers*; the *most* of them being miserably *weake* and *unlearned*; One of their best *defensatives* before his *joyning* with thē, was a *clamor* against *Logicke* and *learning*, as himselfe confesseth in some of his *Epistles*; now this is not only evident by *experience*, but the *nature* of the thing it selfe makes it manifest, that so it will be; whereas men of *low* and weake *Abilityes*, fall into *by persuasions* in Religion, as they generally at first prevaile by *clamours*, and all sorts of *reproaches* cast *on learning*, and *learned men*; yet if God in his *providence* at any time, to *heighten* the temptation, suffer any *person* of *Learning* and *Ability* to *fall in* amongst, and with them, he is *presently* their *Head* and *Ruler* without *controule*; some *Testimony* hereof our *owne daies* have afforded: and I *wish* we may not have more *Examples* given us. Now how farre he prevailed *himselfe* of this *Advantage*, the Consideration of *them*, with whom he *had* to do, of the *esteeme* they had of his *Abilityes*, and the *service* he did them thereby, will acquaint us.

For the *leaders* of them, they were for the *most* part *unlearned*; and so *unable* to defend their *opinions* in any measure against a *skilfull* adversary. (*z*) *Blandrata* their great *patron* was not able to *expresse* himselfe in *latine*, but by the helpe of *Statorius*, who had some *learning*, but no judgment; and therefore upon his *difference* with *Franciscus David* in Transylvania, he was forced to send for *Socinus* out of *Helvetia*, to manage the disputation with him.

(*x*) *Dico secessionem Racovienſium ac delirium, esse ab ecclesia ratione sejungendum, nisi velis concilia bula quæq; amentium* amiculatū *partes ecclesiæ Christianæ aut ecclesiam appellare: Men: Squarcialup.* Epist. ad. *Faustum Socinum.* pag. 8.

(*y*) *Huc accedit, quod Racovienses isti, sive cœtus Racovienſis, quem tu petis atq; oppugnas, vel non amplius extat, vel ita hodiè mutatus est, & in aliam quodammodo formam versus, ut agnosci non queat: Socin: præfat: ad Palæolog.*

(*z*) *Petro Statorio in operam omnem suam fucandis barbarismi scriptoris Blandratæ commentis navante. Beza.*

him. And what kind of *Cattle* thoſe were, with whom he had to do at *Cracovia*, as well as *Racovia*, is manifeſt from the *Epiſtle* of *Simon Ronembergius*, one of the leaders, and *Elders* of *that* which they called *their church*, which is *printed* with *Socinus* his anſwer unto it. I do not *know* that ever in *my life* I ſaw, for *matter* & *forme*, *ſenſe* and *language*, any thing ſo *ſimple*, and *fooliſh*, ſo ridiculouſly *ſenſleſſe*, and *incoherent*, unleſs it were *one* or *two* in our owne daies: which, with *this*, deſerve an *eminent place inter epiſtolas obſcurorum virorum*; And therefore *Socinus* juſtly feared, that his *party* would have the *worſt* in diſputes, as he acknowledges it befell (*a*) *Licinius* in his Conference with *Smiglecius* at *Novograde*; and could not believe (*b*) *Oſtorodus* that he had ſuch *ſucceſſe* as he boaſted in *Germany* with *Fabritius*; and tels us himſelfe a ſtory of (*c*) ſome *Paſtors* of their churches in *Lithuania*, who were ſo *ignorant* and ſimple, that they knew not that Chriſt was to be worſhipped: What a facile thing it was, for a man of his parts, abilities, and learning, to obtaine a *kingdome* amongſt ſuch as theſe, is eaſily gueſſed. (*d*) He complaines indeed of his owne *loſt time*, in his young daies, by the *inſtigation of the Divell*, and ſayes that it made him *weary of his life* to thinke of it, when he had *once ſet up* his thoughts in ſeeking honour and glory, by being the head and maſter of a ſect, as *Ignatius the father* of the Jeſuits did, (with whom as to this *purpoſe* he is compared all along by the *Gentleman* that wrote his life,) yet it is evident, that his *Learning* and *Abilities* were *ſuch*, as eaſily *promoted* him to the *dictatorſhip* among them with whom he had to do.

It may then be eaſily *imagined* what kind of eſteeme ſuch *men* as *thoſe* would have of ſo great an *ornament* and *glory* of their Religion, who at leaſt was *with* them in that, wherein they *diſſented* from the reſt of Chriſtians.

(*a*) *Dolerem equidem mirum in modum ſi diſputatio iſta ſic habita fuiſſet, ut adverſarii affirmant: ſuſpicor tamen nihilomi-nus, quatenus diſputationem ab ipſis editam percurrendo, animadvertere ac conſequi conjectura potui, Licinii antagoniſtam arte diſputandi & ipſo ſuperiorem eſſe, & id in iſtâ ipſâ diſputatione facilè pleriſque conſtitiſſe. nam etſi (ni fallor) Licinius noſter neutiquam in ea Hæreſi eſt, in quâ non pauci ex noſtris ſunt, non eſſe chriſtiano homini dandam operam dialecticæ* Epiſt: *ad Balverovecium* pag. 358.

(*b*) *Voidovius Oſtorodi comes ea ad me ſcribit, quæ vix mihi permittunt ut exitum diſputationis illius cum fuiſſe credam, quem ipſe* Oſtorodus *ad me ſcripſit:* Epiſt. *ad Valent. Smalcium quarta* p. 522.

(*c*) *Quod totum fere pondus illius diſputationis, adverſus eos qui Chriſtum adhuc ignorare dici poſſunt, ſuſtinueris, vehementer tibi gratulor, nihil mihi novum fuit, ex narratione iſtâ percipere, paſtores illos* Lithuanicos *ab ejuſmodi ignoratione minimè liberos deprehenſos fuiſſe* Epiſt. 5. *ad Smalcium*

(*d*) *Me imitari noli, qui neſcio quo malo genio ductore, cum jam divinæ veritatis fontes deguſtaſſem, ita ſum abreptus, ut majorem & potiorem juventutis meæ partem, inanibus quibuſdam aliis ſtudiis, imo inertiæ atque otio dederim, quod cum mecum ipſe reputo, reputo autem ſæpiſſimè, tanto dolore afficior, ut me vivere quodam modo pigeat:* Epiſt. *ad Smal:* pag. 513.

Not

Not only after his *death*, when they set him forth as the most *incomparable man* of his time, but in his owne *life*, and to himselfe, as I know not *what excellent person*: (*e*) that he had *a mind suited* for *the investigation* of *truth*, was a *Philosopher*, an *excellent orator*, an *eminent divine*, that for the *latine tongue especially* he might contend with any of the *great wits* of Europe, they told him to his face; Such thoughts had they *generally* of him: it is then no wonder they gave themselves up to his guidance. Hence *Smalcius* wrote unto him, to consult about the *propriety* of the latine tongue, and in his answer to him he *excuses* (*f*) it, as a great *crime*, that he had used a *reciprocall relative* where there was no *occasion* for *it*.

And to make it more evident how they *depended* on him, on *this account* of his abilitie for instructions, when he had told *Ostorodus* an Answer to an *Objection* of the *Papists*, the *man* having afterwards forgot it, (*g*) sends to him *againe*, to have his *lesson* over once more, that he might *remember* it.

And therefore as if he had been to deale with *School-boyes*, he would tell his *chiefe* (*h*) *companions*, that he had found *out*, and *discovered such*, or *such* a thing in *Religion*, but would not *tell* them untill they had *tryed* themselves, and therefore was *afraid* least he should, through *unawares*, have told it to any of them: upon one of which adventures *Ostorodus* (*i*) making bold to give in his *conception*, he does little better then tell him he is a *blockhead*. Being in this *repute* amongst them, and exercising such a *dominion* in poynt of *Abilities* and *learning*, to prevaile the *more* upon them, he was perpetually *ready* to *undertake* their *quarrels*, which *themselves* were not *able* with any colour to maintaine. Hence most of his *bookes* were written, and his *Disputations* engaged in, upon the desire of one *Assemby*, *Synod*, or *Company* of *them* or other, as I could easily *manifest* by particular instances; and by this *meanes* got he no small *Advantage* to *insinuate* his own principles. For whereas the men *greedily* looked *after*, and

(*c*) *Ad te quod attinet, animo es tu quidem ad omnem doctrinæ rationem, ac veritatis investigationem nato, magna rerum sophisticarum cognitio, orator summus & theologus insignis, linguas tenes maxime latinâ, ut possis cum præcipuis totius Europæ ingeniis certare. Marcel. Squarialup. Epistad. Faustum Socin:*

(*f*) *Aliud interim in latinâ linguâ erratum, gravius quam istud sit, à me est commissum, quod scilicet relativo reciproco ubi nullus erat locus usus sum. Epist. 4. ad Valentinum Smalcium pag. 521.*

(*g*) *Memini te mihi hujus rei solutionem cum esses Racoviæ afferre, sed quæ mea est tarditas, vel potius stupiditas, non bene illius recordor. Ostorod. Epist. ad Faustum Socinum pag. 456.*

(*h*) *Tibi significo me ni fallor invenisse viam quomodo verum esse possit, quod Christus Plane liberè & citra omnem necessitatem Deo perfectissimè obedirit, & tamen necessarium omnino fuerit ut sic obediret; quænam ista via sit, nisi eam ipse per te (ut plane spero) inveneris, postea tibi aperiam: volo enim prius tuum hoc in re & Statorii ingenium experiri, tametsi vereor ne jam eam illi indicaverim, Epist. ad Ostorodum 4. pag. 472.*

(*i*) *De quæstione tibi propositâ non bene conjecisti, nec quam affers solutionem ea probari ullo modo potest. Epist. 6. ad. Ostorod. pag. 473.*

freely

freely entertained the things, which were professedly written in their *defence*; *He* alwaies *wrought in together* therewith something of his owne *peculiar heresy*, that poyson might be taken *downe* with that which was most pleasing. Some of the *wisest* of them indeed as *Niemojevius*, discover'd the *fraud*; who upon his *answer* to *Andraus Volanus*, *commending* what he had written against the *Diety* of Christ, which they imployed him in (*k*) fals *foul* upon him, for his delivering in the same *Treatise*, that *Christ* was not a *Preist* whilest he was upon the earth; which *one abominable figment* lyes at the bottome of his whole Doctrine of the *justification* of a sinner. The case is the same about his judgment concerning the *invocation* of Christ, which was, that *we might do it, but it was not necessary from any precept or otherwise that so we should do.*

And this was *nine* yeares after his coming into *Poland*, as appeares from the date of that *Epistle*; so long was he in getting his *opinions* to be *entertained* among his *friends*. But though *this man* were a little *wary*, and held out some *opposition* with him, yet multitudes of them were taken with this *snare*, and freely *dranke* downe the *poyson* they *loathed*, being *tempered* with that which they had a better *liking* to. But this being discovered he let the rest of them know, that though he was (*l*) *entreated* to write that booke by the *Racovians*, and did it in their name, yet because he had *published* some what of his owne *private* opinions therein, they might if they *pleased deny*, *yea and forsweare that they were not written by their* Appoyntment.

And this was with respect to his *doctrine* about the *satisfaction* of Christ, which as he saies he heard they were coming *over unto*. And it is evident from what he writes else where to *Belcerovicius* that he *begged* this employment of *writing* against *Volanus*; it being agreed by them, that he should *write nothing* but by publike consent, because of the *novelties* which he *broached* every day. By this *readinesse* to appeare and *write* in their *defence* and so commending his *writing* to them on that account, it is *incredible* how he got *ground* upon them, and wonne them over *daily* to the residue of his Abominations, which they had not received.

4 To these adde as another *Advantage* to *winne* upon that

(*k*) *Perlecto scripto tuo contra Volanum animadverti argumenta ejus satis accurate à te refutata, locaque scripturæ pleraque examinata, ac elucidata, verum non sine mærore (ne quid gravius addam) incidi inter legendum in quoddam paradoxon, scripturæ sacræ contrarium ac planè* horrendũ, *dum Christum in morte suâ sive in cruce, sacrificium obtulissè pernegas, miror quid tibi in mentem venerit, ut tam confidenter (nè quid aliud dicam) contra manifesta sacræ scripturæ testimonia pugnare, contrariamque sententiam tueri non timeas Epist. 1. Joh. Niemojev: ad Faust. Socin. pag. 196.*

(*l*) *Rogavit me dominus Schomanus, dominus Simon Ronembergius & alii ut ad parænesin Andreæ Volani responderem, volui ut si quid in hac responsione vobis minus rectè dictum videretur, non bona conscientiâ tantum, sed jure etiam, eam semper ejurare possetis; Epist. ad Mar: Belcerovicium. p. 336.*

people, the course he fixed on, in reference to others, which was to *owne* as *his*, and of *his party*, of the *Church*, all persons what ever, that on any *pretence* what *ever* opposed the doctrine of the *Trinity*, and forsooke the *reformed* Church: Hence he dealt with men as his *brethren*, *friends*, and *companions*; who scarcely retained any thing of *Christians*, some *nothing* at all: as *Martine Seidelius*, who denyed *Christ*: with *Philip Buccel*, who denyed *all difference of good and evill* in the *actions of men*; with *Erasmus Johannes*, an *Arian*, with *Mathias Radecius*, who denyed that any could *beleive in Christ*, without new *Apostles*; indeed with *all*, or *any* sorts of men what ever, that would but *joyne* with *him*, or did consent unto the *opposition* of the *Diety* of *our Lord Jesus Christ*, which was the *principall* worke which he engaged in.

5 Unto *these*, and the *like Advantages*, the man added all the *Arts* and *subtilties*, all the *diligence* and *industry*, that was any way tending to *his* End; some of his *Artifices* and *insinuations* indeed were *Admirable*; though to them who now reveiw them in *cold blood*, without *recalling* to mind the then *state* of things, they may seeme of another complexion. (*m*)

By these, and the *like* meanes, though he once despaired of ever *getting* his *opinions* received amongst them, as he *professeth*, yet in the *long continuance* of 24 yeares (so long he lived in *Poland*) with the help of *Valentinus Smalcius*, *Volkelius* and some few others, who wholly fell in with him, he at length brought them all into subjection to himselfe, and got all his *opinions* inthroned, and his practise taken almost for a *Rule*. So that whereas in *former* daies they accused him for a (*n*) *covetous wretch*, one that did nothing but give his *mind* to *scrape* up money, and were professedly offended with his putting money to *usury*; for his full justification, *Ostorodus* and *Voidovius* in the close of the *compendium* of their Religion which they brought into *Holland*, professe that their (*o*) *churches did not condemne usury, so that it were exercised with moderation, and without oppression.*

I thought to have added a further account in *particular*, of the *mans craft* and *subtilty*, of his *severall* waies for the instilling of his *principles* and *opinions*, of his *personall Temper*, *wrath*, and *Anger*, and *multiplying* of *words* in *disputes*, of the *Foyles* he received in sundry *disputations* with men of his owne *Antitrinitarian* infidelity, of his *ayme* at *Glory* and *renowne*, expressed by the

Polonian

(*m*) *Spero fore, ut si quid illum mecum sentire velit intellexero facile viam inveniam eũ in meam sententiam pertrahendi. Epist. secunda ad Beverovicium.*

(*n*) *Aliqui fratrum putant congerendis pecuniis me nunc prorsus intentum esse. Epist. ad Eliam Arcistrium pag. 407. vide epistolam ad Christoph. Morstinum. pag. 503, 504, 505.*

(*o*) *Non simpliciter usuram damnant: modo æquitatis & charitatis regula non violetur. Compend. Religionis Ostorod. & Voidovii.*

Polonian gentleman, who wrote his life, his *losses* and *troubles* which were not *many*, with all which and the *like* concernments of the *man*, and his *businesse* in that Generation, by the perusall of all that he hath *wrote*, and of *much* that hath been *written* against him, with what is *extant* of the *conferences*, and *disputations*, *Synods*, and *Assemblies* of those daies, I have some little *acquaintance*: but being not convinc'd of much *usefulnesse* in my so doing, I shall willingly spare *my labour*. Thus much was necessary, that we might know the *men* and their *conversation*, who have caused so much *trouble* to the *Christian world*; in which worke, having the assistance of that *Atheisme* & those corrupted *principles*, which are in the *hearts* of all by *nature*, without the *infinite* rich mercy of God sparing a sinfull world as to this judgment, for his *elects* sake, they will undoubtedly proceed.

Leaving *him* then in the possession of his *conquest*, *Tritheits*, *Sabellians*, *Arians*, *Eunomians*, with the followers of *Francis David*, being all lost and *sunke*, and *Socinians* standing up in the roome of them all, looking a little upon what *ensued*; I shall draw from the *consideration* of the *persons* to their *doctrines*, at first proposed.

After the death of *Socinus*, his cause was strongly carryed on by those whom in his *life* he had formed to his owne *mind* and *judgment*. Among whom *Valentinus Smalcius*, *Hyeronmyus Moscorovius*, *Johannes Volkelius*, *Christopherus Ostorodus*, were the cheife; To *Smalcius* he wrote *eleven Epistles* that are extant: professing his great *Expectations* of him, extolling his *learning* and *prudence*. He afterwards wrote the *Racovian Catechisme*, compiling it out of *Socinus* his workes; many *answers* and replies *to*, and with *Smiglecius* the *Jesuite*, and *Franzius* the Lutheran: a booke of the *divinity* of Christ, with *sundry* others, and was a kind of *Professor* among them at *Racovia*. The writings of the rest of them are also *extant*. To him succeeded *Crellius* a man of more *learning* and modesty then *Smalcius*, and of *great* industry for the defence of his *heresy*; his defence of *Socinus* against *Grotius*, his *treatise de causis mortis Christi*, de effectu SS. his *comments*, and *Ethickes*, declare his *Abilities* & *industry* in his way. After him arose *Jonas Schlictingius* a man no whit *behind* any of the *rest* for *learning* and *diligence*, as in his *comments* and *disputations* against *Meisnerus*, is *evident*. As the report is, he was *burned*

by the procurement of the *Jesuites* some 4 *yeare agoe* that they might be *sure* to have *the blood of all sorts of men* found upon them; what Advantage they have obteined thereby, time will shew. I know that *Generation* of men retort upon *us*, the death of *Servetus* at *Geneva*; but the case was far different. *Schlichtingius* lived in his *owne* country and *convers'd* with men of his owne *persuasion*, who in a *succession* had been so, before he was *borne*. *Servetus* came out of *Spaine*, on purpose to *disturbe* and seduce them who knew *nothing* of his Abominations. *Schlichtingius* disputed his *heresy* without *reproaching* or *blaspheming God willingly*, under pretence of *denying* the *way* and *worship* of his *Adversaries*. *Servetus* *stufft* all his discourses with *horrid blasphemies*. *Beza* tels us, that he called the Trinity, *tricipitem Cerberum*, and wrote that *Moses* was a *ridiculous impostour*: *Beza*: Epist. 1. And there are *passages* cited out of his booke of the Trinity (which I have not seene) that *seeme* to have as much of the *Devill* in them, as any thing that ever yet was *written* or spoken by any of the sonnes of men. If, saith he, Christ be the sonne of God, *debuissent ergo dicere*, *quod Deus habebat uxorem quandam spiritualem*, *vel quod solus ipse masculofœmineus aut Hermaphroditus*, *simul erat pater & mater*, *nam ratio vocabuli non patitur*, *ut quis dicatur sine matre pater*: *and*; *si* logos *filius erat*, *natus ex patre sine matre*; *dic mihi quomodo peperit eum*, *per ventrem an per latus*.

To this height of *Atheisme* and *blasphemy* had *Sathan* wrought up the *spirit* of the man. So that I must say, he is the *only person* in the world, that I ever *read* or *heard* of, that ever died upon the account of Religion, in *reference* to whom the *zeale* of them that put him to death may be *acquitted*. But of these things, God will judge: *Socinus* saies he died *calling on Christ*; those that were *present* say the quite contrary; and that in horrour he roared out *misericordia* to the magistrates, but nothing else: But *Arcana Deo*.

Of these men last *named*, their *writings* and *indeavours* for the *propagation* of their *opinion*, others having written already, I shall forbear. Some of *note* amongst them have publickly recanted and renounced their Hæresy, as *Vogelius*, and *Peuschelius* whose *retractations* are answered by *Smalcius*. Neither shall I adde much as to their *present* condition. They have as yet many

Churches

Churches in *Poland* and *Transilvania*: & have their *Superintendents* after the manner of Germany. Regenvolscius (p) tells us, that all the *others* are *sunk* and *lost*, only the *Socinians* remaine. The *Arians* *Sabellians* *David Georgians* with the followers of *Franciscus David* being all gone over to the *confession* of *Socinus*; which make me somewhat wonder at that of *Johannes Lætus* who *affirmes* that about the year 1619 in a *convention* of the *States* in *Poland*, those who *denied that Christ ought to be invocated*, (which were the followers of *Frances David* *Christianus Franken*, and *Palælogus*) *pleaded* that the Liberty that was granted to *Antitrinitarians*, was intended *for them*, and not for the *Socinians*. And the *truth is*, they had *footing* in *Poland* before ever the name of *Socinus* was there *known*, though he *afterwards* (q *insults* upon them, and sayes that they most *impudently* will have themselves called *Christians* when they are not so.

(p) *Denique Socinianæ recensendi mihi venerunt quia Fausto Socino, per Poloniam & Transilvaniam virus suum disseminante, tum nomen tum doctrinam sumpsere; Atq; hi soli, exceptis Farnesianis, anabaptistis & Franciscidavidis sectatoribus supersunt; homines ad fallacias & sophismata facti. Histor. Eccles. Slavon. lib. 1. pag. 90.* (q) *Palæologus præcipuus fuit ex Antesignanis illorum qui Christum nec invocandum, nec adorandum esse hodie affirmant & interim tamen se Christianos esse impudenter profitentur, quo vix quidquam scelestius in Religione nostrâ depravandâ excogitari posse existimo. Socin. Ad. Wiek. Ref. ad cap. 4 cap. 2. pag. 42.*

But what *numbers* they *are*, in those parts of the world, how the *poyson* is drunk in by *thousands*, in the *Papacy*, by what *Advantages* it hath, and continues to *insinuate* it's selfe into *multitudes* living in the outward profession of the *Reformed Churches*, what *progresse* it makes, and what *ground it gets* in our *native* countrey every day, I had rather bewaile, then relate. This I am compel'd to say, that unless the *Lord* in his infinite mercy lay an *awe* upon the *hearts* of men, to keep them in some *Captivity* to the *Simplicity* and *Mystery* of the Gospel, who now strive *every day* to exceed one another in *novel opinions*, and *Philosophical apprehensions* of the things of God, I cannot but *fear* that this *soule destroying Abomination*, will one day break in as a flood upon us.

I shall only adde something of the *occasions* and *Advantages* that these men *took*, and *had*, for the *renewing* and propagation of their *Heresy*, and draw to a close of this discourse.

Not to speak of the *General* and more *remote* causes of *these* and all other *foul destroying Errours*, or the *darknesse*, *pride*, *corruption*, and *wilfulnesse* of men, the *craft*, *subtility*, *envy*, and *malice* of Sathan, the *just revenging hand* of God, giving men *up to a spirit*

of deluſion, that they might *believe lyes*, becauſe they *delighted not in the Truth*, I ſhall only *remarke* one *conſiderable occaſion*, or *ſtumbling* block at which they fell, and drank in the *poyſon*, and one conſiderable *Advantage* that they had for the *propagation* of what they had ſo fallen into.

Their great *ſtumbling* block I look upon to be the *horrible corruption* & abuſe of the *doctrine of the Trinity* in the *writings* of the *Schoolmen*, and the practiſe of the *devotioniſts* among the *Papiſts*. With what *deſperate* boldneſs, *Atheiſtical* curioſity, wretched *inquiries*, and *babling*, the *School men* have *polluted* the doctrine of the *Trinity*, and gone off from the *ſimplicity* of the Goſpel in this great *myſtery*, is ſo *notoriouſly* known, that I ſhall not need to *trouble you* with inſtances for the confirmation of the Obſervation. This, the men ſpoken of, (being the *moſt*, if not *all* of them brought up in the *Papacy*) ſtumbled at. They ſaw the doctrine concerning *that God* whom they were to *worſhip* rendered *unintelligible*, *curious*, *intricate*, involved in *termes* and *expreſſions*, not only *barbarous* in themſelves, and not uſed in the *Scripture*, but *inſignificant*, *Horrid*, and remote from the *Reaſon* of men; which after ſome *ſtrugling* ſet them at *liberty* from under the *bondage* of thoſe *notions*; And when they ſhould have gone to the *Law* and *Teſtimony* for their information, *Sathan* turned them *aſide* to their own *Reaſonings*, and *Imaginations*, where they *ſtumbled* and *fell*. And yet of the *formes* and expreſſions of their *School-men* are the *Papiſts* ſo *Zealous*, as that whoever departs from them in any *Kind* is preſently an *Antitrinitarian* Heriticke. The dealings of *Bellarmine*, *Genebrard*, *Poſſevine* and others, with *Calvin*, are known: One inſtance may be taken of their ingenuity. *Bellarmine* in his book *de Chriſto*, layes it to the charge of *Bullinger*, that in his book *de Scripturæ & Eccleſiæ authoritate*, he wrote, that there were *three Perſons in the Deity*, *non ſtatu, ſed gradu, non ſubſiſtentiâ, ſed Formâ*, *non poteſtate ſed ſpecie differentes*; on which he *exclaimes*, that the *Arians* themſelves never ſpake more *wickedly*: and yet theſe are the very words of *Tertullian* againſt *Praxeas*, which I confeſs are warily to be *interpreted*. But by this their *meaſuring* of Truth by the *Formes* received by *Tradition* from their *fathers*, neglecting and *forſaking* the *ſimplicity* of the Goſpel, that many ſtumbled and fell is moſt evident:

Schluſſelburgius

(r) *Schluffelburgius* in his *wonted* respect and favour unto the *Calvinists*, tells us, that from them and *their* doctrine was the *occasion administred* unto this new Abomination: *Also* that never any turned *Arian*, but he was first a *Calvinist*, which he seemes to make good by a *letter* of *Adam Neuserus*, who as he saith from a *Sacramentarian* turned *Arian*; and afterward a *Mahumetan*, and was *circumcised* at *Constantinople*. *This man* (fayes he) *in a letter from Constantinople to Doctour Gerlachius, tells him, that none turned Arians but those that were Calvinists first: and therefore he that would take heed of Arianisme, had best beware of Calvinisme.* I am very unwilling to call any man's *credit* into question, who relates a matter of *fact*, unlesse undeniable *Evidence* enforce me, because it cannot be *done* without an *imputation* of the *foulest* crime: I shall therefore but take leave to aske

1. What *Credit* is to be given to the Testimony of this man who upon *Conradus* his owne report, was *circumcised*, *turned Mahumetan* and had wholly *renounced* the *Truth* which he once professed. For my *part*, I should expect from such a *person*, nothing but what was *maliciously* contriv'd for the *prejudice* of the truth; & therefore suppose he might raise this on *purpose*, to strengthen and harden the *Lutherans* against the *Calvinists* whom he hated most, because that they professed the truth which he had *renounced*, and that *true knowledge* of Christ and his will, which now he hated: and this *lye* of his, he looked on as an expedient for the *hardening* of the *Lutherans* in their Errour, and helping them with *a stone* to cast at the *Calvinists*.

2. Out of what *kindesse* was it that this man bare to *Gerlachius*, and his *companions*, that he gives them this *courteous* Admonition o beware of *Calvinisme*. Is it any honour to *Gerlachius*, *Conradus* himselfe, or any other *Lutheran*, that an Apostate, an abjurer of *Christian Religion loved* them better then he did the *Calvinists*? what person this *Adam Neuserus was*, and what the end of him was, we have an account given by *Maresius* from a manuscript History of *Altingius*. From *Heidleberge*, being suspected of a *conspiracy* with one *Sylvanus*, who for it was put to death, he fled into *Poland*, thence to *Constantinople*; where he turned *Mahumetan*

(r) *Notatu vero dignissimum est hisce novis Arianis ad* apostasiam *seu* Arianismum *occasionem fuisse*, doctrinam Calvinistarum, *id quod* ipsi Ariani *haud obscure professi sunt. Recitabo hujus rei exemplum memorabile de Adamo Neusero ante paucos annos Ecclesiæ Heidelbergensis ad S. S.* primario *pastore nobilissimo* Sacramentario. *Hic ex* Zvingli*anismo per Arianismum ad* Mahometismum *usque, cũ aliis non paucis Calvinistis Constantinopolin circumcisionem judaicam recipiens & veritatem agnitam abnegans progressus est. Hic* Adamus *sequentia verba dedit Constantinopol. D.* Gerlachio *Anno* 1574. *nullus nostro tempore mihi notus factus est Arianus qui non antea fuerit Calvinista. Servetus &c. igitur qui sibi timet ne incidat in Arianismum, caveat Calvinismum.*

and

and was *circumcised*; and after a while fell into *such miserable horror* and despaire, that with *dreadful yellings* and *clamours*, he dyed; so that the *Turkes* themselves confess, that they never heard of a more horrid, *detestable*, and *tragical* end of any man; whereupon they commonly called him, *Satan Ogli*, or the son of the *Divel*: and so much good may it doe *Conradus*, with his witnesse.

3. But what Occasion I pray does *Calvinisme* give to *Arianisme*, that the One should be taken *heed* of, if we intend to *avoid* the other: What *offence* doth it give to men enquiring after the *Truth* to make them stumble on their Abominations? What *Doctrine* doth it maintaine that should *prepare* them for it? but no man is *bound* to burden *himselfe* with more then he can *carry*, & therefore all such enquiries *Schlusselburgius* took no notice of.

The truth is, many of the *persons* usually instanced in, as *Apostates* from *Calvinisme* to *Arianisme*, were such, as leaving *Italy* and other parts of the *Popes Dominion*, came to shelter themselves, where they expected *liberty*, and *opportunity* of venting their abomination among the reformed Churches, and joyned themselves with *them* in *outward* profession: most of *them* as afterwards appeared, being *throughly infected* with the *errours* against the *Trinity*, and about the *Godhead*, before they left the *Papacy* where they stumbled and fell.

2. In the *practise* of the Church (as it is called) wherein they were *bred*, they nextly *saw* the *horrible Idolatry* that *was* countenanced in abominable *Pictures* of the *Trinity*, and the *worship* yeelded to them, which strengthened and fortified their *minds* against such gross *Conceptions* of the *nature of God*, as by those *pictures* were exhibited.

Hence when they had left the *Papacy*, and set up their *opposition* to the *Blessed Trinity*, in all their bookes they still *made* mention of those *Idols* and *Pictures*, speaking of them as the *God of those that worshipped* the Trinity; this instance *makes* up a good part of their book *de falsâ & verâ cognitione unius Dei, Patris, Filii, & Spiritûs Sancti*, written in the name of the Ministers of the *Churches in Sarmatia*, and *Transilvania*: a book full of *reproach* and blasphemies: but this I say was annother occasion of *stumbling* to those miserable Wretches: they knew what thoughts the men of their *comunication* had *of God*, by the *Pictures* made of him, and the worship

worship they yielded to them. They knew, how abhorrent to the *very principles of Reason* it was, that God should be such, as by them represented; and therefore set themselves at liberty (or rather gave up *themselves* to the service of *Sathan*) to find out *another God* whom they might worship.

Neither are they a little *confirmed* to this day in their *errours* by sundry *principles*, which under the *Roman Apostacy* got *footing* in the *minds* of men professing the name of Jesus Christ: particularly they sheltered themselves from the sword of the *Word* of God, evidencing the *Deity* of Christ, by *Ascribing* to him *divine Adoration*, by the *sheild* of the *Papists doctrine*, that those who are not God by nature may be *adored, worshipped*, and *invocated*.

Now that to this day the Papists *continue* in the same Idolatry (to touch that by the way) I shall give you for your Refreshment a coppy of *verses* or two, whose *Poetry* does much *outgoe* the old.

O crux spes unica *Hoc passionis tempore*
Auge piis constantiã *Reisq; dona veniam.*

And whose *blasphemy* comes not at all short of it: The first is of *Clarus Bonarous* the Jesuite. *lib.* 3. *Amphitrial. Honor. lib.* 3. *cap. ult. ad divinam Hallensem & puerum* Jesum, as followeth;

Hæreo hæc inter meditans, interq; cruorem
Inter delicicias uberis & lateris.
Et dico (si fortè oculos super ubera tendo)
Diva parens mammæ gaudia posco tuæ.
Sed dico, (si deinde oculos in vulnera verto)
O Jesu lateris gaudia malo tui.
Rem scio prensabo si fas erit ubera dextra
Læva prensabo vulnera si dabitur.
Lac matris miscere volo cum sanguine nati
Non possem antidoto nobiliore frui
Vulnera restituant turpem ulceribus mendicum
Testa cui saniem radere sola potest.
Ubera reficient Ismaëlem silientem
Quem Sara non patitur, quem neq; nutrit Agar
Ista mihi ad pestem, procul & procul expungendam
Ista mihi ad longas evalitura febres.
Ira vomit flammas, sumat q; libidinis Ætna
Suffocare queo sanguine, lacte queo.

Livor inexpleta rubigine ſavit in artus
Detergere queo lacte, cruore queo:
Vanus honos me perpetua prurigine tentat
Exſaturare queo ſanguine, lacte queo.
Ergo parens & nate, meis advertite votis
Lac peto, & pereo ſanguinem, utrumq; volo.
O ſitio tamen! ô vocem ſitis intercludit.
Nate cruore ſitim comprime lacte parens.
Dic matri, meus hic frater ſitit, optima mater,
Vis è fonte tuo promere, deq; meo.
Dic nato, tuus hic frater mi mellee fili
Captivus monſtrat vincula, lytron habes.
Ergo Redemptorem monſtra te jure vocari
Nobilior reliquis ſi tibi ſanguis ineſt.
Tuq; parens monſtra, matrem te jure vocari
Ubera ſi reliquis divitiora geris.
O quando lactabor ab ubere, vulnere paſcar?
Delicii; fruar, mamma latuſq; tuis

Hoc tantum dicam, cum nuper Bellarmini diſputationum primum tomum evolverem, ſupra modum me miratum fuiſſe, quod ad finem fere ſingularum controverſiarum homo alioqui acutus ac ſagax ea verba aut ſcuraverit aut permiſerit adſcribi: Laus Deo Virginiq; Matri: quibus verbis manifeſtè Virgini Mariæ divinus cultus, aut ex æquo cum ipſo Deo, aut certe ſecundum Deum exhibetur. Socin. ad Weik cap. 1. pag. 22.

The other is of *Franciſcus de Mendoza in viridario utriuſq; eruditionis lib. 2. prob. 2.* as enſueth,

Ubera me matris, nati me vulnera paſcunt
Scilicet hæc animi ſunt medicina mei,
Nam mihi dum Lachrymas amor elicit ubera ſugo
Rideat ut dulci maſtus amore dolor.
At me pertentant dum gaudia, vulnera lambo
Ut me læta pio miſta dolore juvent.
Vulnera ſic nati, ſic ubera ſugo parentis
Securæ ut variæ ſint mihi forte vices.
Quis ſine lacte precor, vel quis ſine ſanguine vivat?
Lacte tuo genetrix, ſanguine nate tuo.
Sit lac pro Ambroſia, ſuavi pro nectare ſanguis
Sic me perpetuum vulnus & uber alit.

And this their *Idolatry* is objected to them by *Socinus*, who marvels at the impudence of *Bellarmine* cloſing his books of *Controverſies* (as is the manner of the men of that *ſociety*) with *laus Deo, Virginiq; matri Mariæ*: wherein as he ſayes (and he ſaies it truely) *divine honour* with God, is aſcribed to the *bleſſed Virgin*.

The

The Truth is, I see not any *difference* between that Dedication of himselfe and his worke, by *Redemptus Baranzanus* the *Priest*, in these words, *Deo, virginiq; matri, Sancto Paulo, Bruno, Alberto, Redempto, Francisco, Clarae, Joannae, Catharinae Senensi, divisq; omnibus, quos peculiari cultu honorare desidero, omnis meus labor consecratus sit* (*Baranzan. Nov. Opin. Physic. Diglad.*) and that of the *Athenians* by the advise of *Epimenides* Θεοῖς Ἀσίας, καὶ Εὐρώπης, καὶ Λιβύης, θεῷ ἀγνώστῳ καὶ ξένῳ. both of them being suitable to the *Counsel* of *Pythagoras*

Ἀθανάτους μὲν πρῶτα θεούς, νόμῳ ὡς διάκειται,
Τίμα, καὶ σέβου ὅρκον ἔπειθ' ἥρωας ἀγανούς
Τούς τε καταχθονίους σέβε δαίμονας, ἐννομα ῥέζων,

Let them be sure to *worship* all sorts that they may not misse. And by these meanes, amongst *others*, hath an occasion of *stumbling* and *hardening* been given to these *poore soules*.

2 As to the *propagation* of their *conceptions*, they had the Advantage, not only of an *unsetled time*, as to the civil *government* of the *nations* of the world; most *Kingdomes*, and *Commonweales* in *Europe* undergoing in that Age *considerable mutations* and changes, (a season wherein commonly the *Envious* man hath taken *opportunity* to sow his *tares*) but also *men* being set at *Liberty* from the *bondage* under which they were *kept* in the *Papacy*, and from making the *Tradition* of their Fathers the Rule of their *worship* and walkings, were *found* indeed to have upon *abiding* grounds, no *principles of* Religion at all; and therefore were *earnest* in the *Enquiry* after *something* that they *might fix* upon. What to *avoid* they knew, but what to *close* withal, they knew not. And therefore it is no *Wonder*, if among so many (I may say) *millions* of Persons, as in those dayes there were, that fell off from the *Papacy*, some *thousands* perhaps (much more *Scores*) might in their *Enquirings*, from an extreme of *superstition*, run into another of almost *Atheisme*. Such was the estate of *things* and *men* in those *dayes*, wherein *Socinianisme*, or the *opposition* to Christ of this *latter* edition, set *forth* in the world; Among the *many* that were *convinced* of the *Abominations* of *Popery*, before they were well *fixed* in the *Truth*, some were *deceived* by the *cunning sleight* of some *few men*, that lay in waite to deceive. What e-

vent and *issue* and alike *state* and condition of *things* and *Persons*, hath gone *forth* unto, in the places and *days* wherein we live, is known to all: And that the *Saints* of God may be *warned* by these things, is this *addresse* to them. To what hath been *spoken*, I had thought for a close of *this* discourse, to have given an *account* of the learning that these men profess, and the course of their *studies*, of their *way of disputing*, and the *Advantages* they have therein; to have *instanced* in some of their considerable *sophismes*, and *subtile depravations* of Scripture; as also to have given a *specimen* of *distinctions* and *answers*, which may be improved to the *discovering* and sleighting of their *fallacies*, in the most *important* heads of *Religion*: but being diverted by new and unexpected *Avocations*, I shall refer *these*, and other *considerations*, unto a *Prodromus* for the use of *younger Students*, who intend to look into these Controversies.

And these are the *Persons* with whom we have to *deale*; these their wayes and *progresse* in the world. I shall now *briefly subjoyne* some *Advantages* they have had, *something* of the *way* and *method*, wherein they have *proceeded* for the *diffusing* of their *poyson*, with some general *preservatives* against the *infection*, and draw to a *close* of this discourse.

1 At the first *entrance* upon their undertaking, some of *them* made no small *Advantage* in dealing with *weak* and *unwary men*, by *crying out*, that the termes of *Trinity*, *Person*, *Essence*, *Hypostatical union*, *Communication* of *properties*, and the like, were not found in the Scripture, and therefore were to be abandoned.

With the *colour* of this plea, they once prevailed so farre on the *Churches* in *Transylvania*, as that they *resolved* and *determined*, to abstaine from the *use* of *those words*: But they quickly *perceived*, that though the *words* were not of *absolute necessity*, to expresse the *things* themselves to the minds of *Believers*, yet they were *so*, to *defend the Truth* from the *opposition* and craft of *Seducers*: And at length recovered themselves by the advice of (*s*) *Beza*

(*s*) *Nam ego quidem sic statuo, & si non pendet aliundè rerum sacrarum veritas quam ab unico Dei verbo, & sedulò vitanda est nobis omnis κενοφωνία:*

Tamèm sublatis essentiæ & hypostaseon discrimine (quibuscúnque tandem verbis utaris) & abrogato ὁμοουσίῳ, vix ac ne vix quidem istorum blasphemorum fraudes detegi, & errores satis perspicuè coargui posse. Nego quoque sublatis vocabulis naturæ, proprietatis, hypostaticæ unionis, ἰδιωμάτων κοινωνίας, posse Nestorii & Eutichei blasphemias commodè a quoquam refelli: quâ in re si forte hallucinor, hoc age, nobis demonstret qui potest, & nos illum coronabimus. Beza. Epist. 81.

Yea

yea and (t) *Socinus* himselfe doth not only *grant*, but *prove*, that in Generall this is not to be *imposed on* men, that the doctrine they *assert* is contained in scripture, in so *many words*, seeing it sufficeth that the *thing* it selfe pleaded for, be contained therein. To which purpose I desire the learned Reader to peruse his words, seeing he gives an *instance* of what he speaks, somewhat opposite to a *grand notion* of his *disciple*, with whom I have cheifly to do: yea! and the same (u) *person* rejects the plea of his *companions*, of the not expres *usage* of the termes wherein the doctrine of the *Trinity* is delivered in the Scripture, as weake and frivolous. And this hath made me a little *marvaile* at the precipitate *undigested conceptions* of some, who in the mid'st of the *flames* of *Socinianisme* kindling upon us on every side, would (contrary to the wisdome and practice of all Antiquity, no *one Assembly* in the *world* excepted) tye us up to a *forme* of *confession* composed of the *bare words* of the *scripture* in the order wherein they are there placed. If we *profess* to beleive that *Christ is God blessed for ever*, and the *Socinians* tells us, true! but *he is a God by office, not by nature*; is it not *lawfull* for us to say, nay! but he *is God of the same nature, substance, and essence with his father*. If we shall say that *Christ is God one with the father*, and the *Sabellians* shall tell us, *true* they are *every way one*, and in *all respects*; so that the *whole Deity was incarnate*; is it not *lawfull* for us to *tell them*, that though he be one in *nature and Essence* with his *father*, yet he is *distinct* from him in *person*: and the like instances may be given for all the *Expressions* wherein the *doctrine* of the blessed *Trinity* is delivered, The Truth is, we have sufficient ground for these *Expressions* in the scripture, as to the *words*, and not only the *things* signified by them: the *nature* of God we have Gal. 4 8. The *person* of the *father*, and the son distinct from it, Heb: 1.3. The *Essence* of God Exod: 3. 14. Revel: 1. 4. The *Trinity* 1 Joh: 5. 7. The *Deity*, Col: 2. 9.

(t) *Ais igitur adversus id quod à me affirmatum fuerat, in controversis dogmatibus probandis, aut improbandis, necesse esse literam adferre, & id quod asseritur manifeste demonstrare: id quod asseritur, manifestè demonstrari debere planè concedo; literam autem adferre necesse esse prorsus nego; me autem jure hoc facere id apertè confirmat, quod quædam dogmata in Christi ecclesia receptissima, non solum per expressam literam non probantur, sed ipsam sibi contrariam habent. Exempli causâ, inter omnes fere Christiani nominis homines receptissimum est, Deum non habere membra corporis, ut aures, oculos, nares, brachia, pedes, manus, & tamen non modo expressè & literaliter (ut vocant) id scriptum in sacris libris non est: verum etiam contrarium omnino passim diserte scriptum exist: Faust: Socin: Frag: disput: de Ador: Christi cum Fran: David Cap. 10. pag 59.*

(u) *Simile quod affero de vocabulis essentiæ, & personarum à nobis repudiatis, quia in sanctis literis non inveniantur, non est admittendum, nemini enim verè cordato persuadebitis id quod per ea vocabula adversarii significare voluerunt, idcirco repudiandum esse, quia ipsa vocabula scripta non inveniantur, imò quicunque ex nobis hac ratione sunt usi. suspectum apud nonnullos, alioquin ingenio, & eruditione præstantes viros, causam nostram reddidere: idem. ubi sup: pag. 62.*

2. Their whole *buſineſs* in all their *bookes*, and *diſputations* is to take upon themſelves the parts of *Anſwerers*, ſo *cavilling* and making *exceptions*, not caring at all what becomes of *any* thing in *Religion*, ſo they may with any *colour* avoide the Arguments wherewith they are preſſed. Hence almoſt all their *bookes*, unleſs it be ſome few ſhort *Catechiſmes*, and *confeſſions*, are only Anſwers and exceptions to other mens writings. Beſide the *fragments* of a *Catechiſme* or *two*, Socinus himſelfe wrote very little but of this *kind*; ſo do the reſt. How *heavy* & *dull* they are in aſſerting, may be ſeene in *Volkelius* his *inſtitutions*: And here whilſt they eſcape their *Adverſaries*, they are *deſperately bold* in their *Interpretations* of Scripture: Though for the moſt part it ſuffices, that what is *urged* againſt them, is not the *ſenſe* of the place, though they *themſelves* can aſſigne no ſenſe at all to it. I could eaſily give *inſtances* in abundance to make good this obſervation concerning them, but I ſhall not mention what muſt *neceſſarily* be inſiſted on, in the enſuing diſcourſe. Their Anſwers are: This *may* otherwiſe be *expounded*, it *may* otherwiſe be *underſtood*; the word *may* have another *ſignification* in another place.

3. Their greateſt *Triumphs* which they *ſet up* in their owne *conceits* are, when by any wayes they *poſſeſſe* themſelves of any uſuall *maxime*, that paſſes *currant* amongſt *men*, being applied to *finite*, *limited*, *created things*, or any *acknowledged notion* in *philoſophy*, and apply it to the *infinite uncreated eſſence of* God. Then which courſe of *proceeding* nothing indeed can be more abſurd, fooliſh, and contrary to ſound Reaſon. That God and man, the *Creator* and *creature*, that which is *abſolutely infinite*, and *independent*, and that which is *finite*, *limited*, and *dependent*, ſhould be meaſured by the *ſame rules*, *notions*, and *conceptions*, unleſs it be by way of *eminent Analogy*, which will not further their deſigne at all, is moſt *fond* and *ſenſleſs*. And this one obſervation is ſufficient to arme us againſt all their *profound* diſputes about *eſſence*, *perſonality*, and the like.

4 Generally (as was ſaid) in the purſuit of their *deſigne*, and carrying it on, they begin in exclaiming againſt the *uſuall words* wherein the *doctrines* they oppoſe are taught and delivered. They are not ſcripture expreſſions, &c: for the *things* themſelves, they do not *oppoſe* them; but they thinke them not *ſo neceſſary* as *ſome ſuppoſe*; having got *ſome ground* by *this* on the *minds* of men, great

ſtreſs

ſtreſs is immediatly laid on *this*, that a *man may be ſaved* though he believe not the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*; the *ſatisfaction* of Chriſt &c. ſo that *he live holily*, & *yeild obedience* to the *precepts* of Chriſt; ſo that it is mere *madneſs* and *folly* to breake *Love* and *Communion* about ſuch *differences*; By this *engine* I knew not long *ſince* a choice *ſociety* of Chriſtians, through the *cunning* ſlights of *one lying in wait* to deceive, diſturbed, divided, broken, and in no *ſmall* part of it *infected*. If they once get this *Advantage*, and have thereby *weakned* the *love* and valuation of the *truth* with any; they generally through the *righteous judgment of God*, giving up men of light and *vaine ſpirits* to the imaginations of their owne *hearts*, *overthrow their faith*, and lead them *captive* at their pleaſure.

5. I thought to have *inſiſted* in *particular*, on their particular *waies* of inſinuating their *Abominations*, of the *baites* they lay, the *devices* they have, their high *pretences* to *Reaſon*, and *holineſs* in their lives, or *honeſty*; as alſo to have *evinced* by undeniable *evidences*, that there are 1000s in the *Papacy*, and among the reformed *Churches*; that are wholy *baptized* into their *vile opinions* and *infidelity*, though for the love of their *temporall enjoyments*, which are better to them then their *Religion*, they profeſs it not.

As alſo how this perſuaſion of *their's* hath been the great *doore* whereby the flood of *Atheiſme* which is broken in upon the *World* and which is almoſt *profeſſed* by them, who would be accounted the *wits* of the times, is come in upon the *nations*: further, to have given *generall anſwers*, and *diſtinctions* applicable to the *moſt*, if not all of the *conſiderable Arguments*, and *objections* wherewith they *impugne* the truth. But referring all *theſe* to my *Generall* conſiderations for the *ſtudy* of *Controverſies* in *divinity*; with ſome *obſervations* that may be preſervatives againſt their poyſon, I ſhall ſpeedily *acquit* you from the trouble of this *addreſs*. Give me leave then in the *laſt* place (though *unfit* and *unworthy*) to give ſome *generall cautions* to my *fellow labourers* & *ſtudents* in *divinity*, for the freeing our *ſoules* from being *tainted* with theſe *Abominations*, and I have done.

1. Hold faſt *the* forme of *wholſome* words, & ſound doctrine: *know* that there are other *waies* of *peace* and *Accommodation* with *diſſenters*, then by *letting* go the leaſt *particle* of *Truth*. When men ſhould accommodate their owne hearts to *love* and *peace*, they muſt not *double* with their *ſoules*, and accommodate the *truth* of the

the Gospell to other mens *imaginations*; perhaps some will *suggest* great things of going a *midle way* in *divinity* between *dissenters*: but what is the *issue* for the *most part* of such *proposals*? after they have by their *middle waies* raised *no lesse contentiour*, then was *before* between the *extreames* (yea when things before were in some good measure *allayed*) the *Accommodator's* themselves, through an *ambitious* desire to make good, and defend their owne *expedients*, are *insensibly* carryed over to the *party* and extreame to *whom* they thought to make a *condescension* unto; and by endeavouring to *blancke* their *opinions* to make them seeme *probable*, they are ingaged to the defence of their *consequences*, before they are aware: *Amiraldus* (whom I looke upon as one of the *greatest wits* of these daies) will at present go a *middle way* between the *Churches* of *France*, and the *Arminians*, what hath been the issue? among the *Churches*, *divisions*, *tumult*, *disorder*; among the *professors* and *ministers*, *revilings*, *evill surmisings*; to the whole *body of the people*, *scandals* and *offences*; and in respect of himselfe, *evidence* of daily approaching nearer to the *Arminian* party, untill as one of them saith of him, he is *not farre* from (their) *kingdome of heaven*; but is this all? nay but *Grotius*, *Episcopius*, (w) *Curcellaus &c.* (*quanta nomina*) with *others*, must go *a middle way* to accommodate with the *Socinians*, and all that will not *follow* are *rigid* men, that by any *meanes* will defend the *opinions* they are fallen upon. The same plea is made by others for *Accommodation* with the *papists*, and still *moderation*, the *midle way*, *condescension* are cryed up. I can *freely* say, that I know not that man in *England*, who is willing to *goe* further in *forbearance*, *Love*, and Communion with all that *feare God*, and hold the *foundation*, then I am, but that *this* is to be done upon other *grounds*, *principles*, and *waies*, by other *meanes*, and *expedients*, then by a *condescention* from the *exactnes* of the least *apex* of Gospell truth, or by an *Accommodation* of doctrines by loose and *generall termes*, I have else where sufficiently declared. Let no man *deceive* you with vaine pretences: hold fast the *truth* as it is in Jesus, part not with one *jota*, and contend for it, when called thereunto.

(w) *Quotquot hactenus Theologica tractarunt, id sibi negotii crediderunt solum dari, ut quâ sive sors illis obtulerat, sive judicio amplexi erant sententiam, totis illam viribus tuerentur; Curcellæus præfat. ad opera Episcop.*

2. Take heed of the *snare of Sathan* in affecting *Eminency* by *singularity*. It is good to strive to *excell*, and to go before one *another* in *knowledge* and in *light*, as in *holinesse* and *obedience*. To do *this* in the *road*, is difficult. *Ahimaaz* had not outrun *Cushi*, but that

that he tooke *a by path.* Many finding it *impossible* to *emerge* unto my *consideration*, by *walking* in the beaten path of *truth*, (*all parts of Divinity*, all waies of *handling* it, being *carryed* already to such an *height* and *excellency*, that to make any considerable *improvement* requires great *pains*, *study*, and an insight into all kind of learning,) and yet not able to conquer the *itch* of being accounted τίνες μεγάλοι, *turne aside* into *by waies*; and *turne* the *eyes* of all men to them, by *scambling* over *hedge* and *ditch*, when the *sober traveller* is not at all regarded.

The *Roman Historian* giving an account of the *degeneracy* of *Eloquence*, after it once came to its *height* in the time of *Cicero*, fixeth on *this* as the most probable *Reason*. *difficile in* perfecto mora *est*; *naturalitèrque quod procedere non potest*, recedit; *& ut ad consequendos quos priores ducimus accedimus: Ita ubi præteriri, aut æquari eos posse desperamus, studium cum spe segnescit, & quod assequi non potest, sequi desinit; & velut occupatam relinquens materiam, quærit novam: præteritoq́, eo in quo eminere non possumus, aliquid in quo nitamur conquærimus; sequitúrque ut frequens ac mobilis transitus maximum perfecti operis impedimentum sit. Paterc: Hist: Rom: lib:*

1. I wish some such *things* may not be said of the doctrine of the reformed Churches. It was not *long since* raised to a great *height* of *purity* in its selfe, and *perspicuity* in the way of its delivery; but (x) *athleticks* constitutions are seldome permanent: men would not be *content* to *walke after* others, & finding they could not *excell* what was done, they have given over to *imitate* it, or to do any thing in the like kind: and therefore *neglecting* that wherein they could not be *eminent*, they have taken *a course* to have some thing *peculiar*, wherein to put forth their endeavours. Let us then watch against this temptation, and know that a man may be *higher* then his brethren, and yet be but a *Saul*.

(x) ἐν τοῖσι γυμναστικοῖσιν αἱ ἐπ' ἄκρον εὐεξίας, σφαλεραὶ, ἢν ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῳ ἔωσιν· οὐ γὰρ δύνανται μένειν ἐν τῷ αὐτέῳ οὐδὲ ἀτρεμέειν· ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἀτρεμέουσιν οὐδέ τι δύνανται ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἐπιδιδόναι, λείπεται ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον: *Hipocrat: Aphoris: lib. 1.* § 11.

3. Let not any *attempt dealing* with these men, that is not in some *good measure* furnished with those kinds of *literature*, and those *common Arts*, wherein they excell: as first, the *knowledge* of the *Tongues*, wherein the *scripture* is *written*; namely the *Hebrew* and *Greeke*. He that is not in some *measure* acquainted with *these*, will scarcely make *through worke* in *dealing* with them. There is not a *word*, nor scarce a *letter* in a word, (if I may so speake) which they do not *search*, and toss up and downe; not an *expression* which they pursue not through the whole *scripture*, to see if any place

will give *countenance* to the Interpretation of it, which they embrace. The *curious* use of the Greeke *Articles*, which as *Scaliger* cals them, are *loquaciſſimæ Gentis flabellum*, is their great *covert* againſt the Arguments for the *Deity* of Chriſt: Their *diſputes* about the *Hebrew* words, wherein the doctrine of the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt* is *delivered* in the Old Teſtament, the enſuing *treatiſe* will in part manifeſt. Unleſs a man can *debate* the *uſe* of *words* with them, in the ſcripture, and by inſtances from other *approved Authors*, it will be *hard* ſo to *encloſe* or ſhut them up, but that they will make way to *evade* and *eſcape*. Preſs them with any *Teſtimony* of ſcripture, if to any *one word* of the *Teſtimony*, whereon the ſenſe of the whole in any meaſure *depends*, they can except, that in *another place* that *word* in the *Originall* hath *another* ſignification, and therefore it is not *neceſſary* that it ſhould here *ſignify* as you urge it; unleſs you are able to *debate* the *true meaning* and import of the *word* with them, they ſuppoſe they have done enough to evade your *Teſtimony*. And no leſs (nextly,) are the *common arts* of *Logick* and *Rhetorick* wherein they *exerciſe* themſelves: Among all *Socinus* his workes, there is none more *pernicious* then the little *Treatiſe* he wrote about *Sophiſmes*, wherein he labours to give *inſtances* of all manner of *ſophiſticall Arguments*, in thoſe which are produced for the confirmation of the doctrine of the *Bleſſed Trinity*.

He that would *reinforce* thoſe *Arguments*, and *vindicate* them from his *exceptions*, and the *entanglements* caſt upon them, without ſome *conſiderable* acquaintance with the *principles* of *Logick*, and *Artificial* Rules of *Argumentation*, will find himſelfe at a *loſſe*: Beſides, of all men in the world in their *Argumentations* they are moſt *Sophiſticall*: It is ſeldome that they urge any *Reaſon*, or give any *exception*, wherein they conclude not *à particulari ad univerſale*, or *ab indefinito ad vniverſale*, *excluſivè*, or *ab aliquo ſtatu Chriſti ad omnem*, or *ab œconomia Trinitatis ad Theologiam Deitatis*, or *ab uſu vocis alicubi* to *ubiq;*. As, *Chriſt is a man*, therefore not God. He is *the ſervant* of the Father, therefore not of the *ſame nature*, and the like inſtances may be given in Abundance: From which *kind of arguing* he will hardly *extricate* himſelfe, who is ignorant of the rudiments of *Logick*. The frequency of *figurative* expreſſions, which they make uſe of to their *Advantage* in the *Scripture*, requires the knowledge of *Rhetorick* alſo, in him that will deal with them, to any good purpoſe: A

good Assistance (in the former of these especially) is given to Students, by *Keslerus*, *in examine Logicæ*, *Metaphysicæ*, *& Physicæ Photinianæ* : The pretended *maximes* also which they insist on from the *Civil Law*, in the business of the *satisfaction* of Christ, which are especially urged by *Socinus*, and *Crellius* in his defence against *Grotius*, will make *him* who shall *engage with them*, see it necessary in some *measure* to be *acquainted* with the *principles* of that *faculty* and Learning also.

With *those* who are *destitute* of these, the great spirit of *Truth* is an abundantly sufficiently preserver from all the *cunning sleights* of *men* that lye in waite to *deceive*. He can *give them to believe and suffer for the truth* : but that they should at any time *look upon* themselves as called to *read* the *books*, or *dispute* with the men of these *Abominations*, I can see no ground.

4 Alwaies beare in mind the gross *figments* that they seek to assert and establish in the Room of *that*, which they cunningly and subtilly oppose. Remember that the *ayme* of their Arguments against the *Deity of Christ*, and the *blessed Trinity*, is to set up *two true Gods*, the one so by *nature*, the other *made so* ; the one *God* in his own *Essence*, the other a *God* from him by *office*: that *was* a man, *is a* spirit, and shall cease to be a *God* : And some farther account *hereof* you will meet with in the close of the ensuing Treatise.

5 Diligent, *constant*, *serious reading*, *studying*, *meditating* on the *Scriptures*, with the *assistance* and directions of all the *Rules* & *Advantages* for the right understanding of them, which by the *Observation* and *diligence* of many *Worthies*, we are *furnished* withal, accompanied with continual *Attendance* on the *throne of Grace*, for the *presence* of the *spirit of truth* with us, *to lead us into all truth*, and to encrease his *annointing* of us *day* by *day*, *shining* into our hearts to give us the *knowlege of the glory of God*, *in the face of Jesus Christ*, is, as for all *other things* in the course of our pilgrimage, and walking with God, so for our preservation against these *abominations*, and the enabling of us to discover their *madnesse*, and answer their *objections*, of *indispensible necessity*. *Apollos* who was mighty in the *Scriptures*, Acts. 18. 24. did *mightily* convince the *gainesaying Jewes*, vers. 28. neither in *dealing* with *these men* is there any *better course* in the *world*, then in a good *order* and *method* to *multiply Testimonies* against them, to the same

purpose. For whereas they have *shifts* in readiness to every *particular* and *hope* to *darken* a single *starre*, when they are gathered into a *constellation*, they send out a *glory* and *brightnesse* which they cannot *stand* before. Being ingaged *my selfe* once in a *publick dispute* about the *satisfaction of Christ*, I took this course, in a clear and *evident coherence* producng *very many Testimonies* to the *confirmation* of it; which *together* gave such an Evidence to the *Truth*, that one who *stood by*, instantly affirmed, that there was enough *spoken* to stop the mouth of *the Divel* himselfe. And this course in the *businesse* of the *Deity* and *Satisfaction of Christ*, will certainly be *triumphant*. Let us then *labour* to have our *senses* abundantly *exercised* in the *Word*, that we may be able to *discern between good and evill*, and that not by *studying* the *places* themselves that are *controverted*, but by a *diligent search* into the *whole mind and will of God*, as revealed in the word, wherein the *sense* is given in to *humble soules*, with more life, *power*, evidence of truth, & is more effectual for the begetting *of faith* and *love* to the truth, then in a *curious* search after the *Annotations of men* upon *particular* places. And truely I must needs *say*, that I know not a *more deplorable mistake* in the *studies* of *Divines*, both *Preachers* and *others*, then their *diversion* from an *immediate direct study* of the *Scriptures* themselves, unto the studying of *Commentatours*, *Criticks*, *Scholiasts*, *Annotatours*, and the *like helps*, which God in his *good providence* making use of the Abilities, & sometimes the Ambition, and *ends* of men, hath *furnished* us withal: not that I *condemne the use* and *study* of them, which I wish men were *more diligent* in, but desire *pardon* if I *mistake*, and doe only *surmise* by the *experience* of my own *folly* for many yeares, that many which *seriously study* the things of God, doe yet *rather* make it their *businesse* to *enquire* after the sense of *other men* on the *Scriptures*, then to *search* studiously into *them* themselves.

6 That direction in this kind, which with me is *instar omnium*, is, for a *diligent endeavour* to have the *power of the truths professed* and *contended* for, abiding upon our *hearts*, that we may not *contend* for *notions*; but what we have a *practical acquaintance* with in our own soules. When the *heart* is cast *indeed* into the *mould* of the doctrine that the mind *embraceth*, when the *Evidence* and *Necessity* of the *Truth* abides in us, when not the *sense* of the *words* only is in our *heads*, but the *sense of the things* abides in our

hearts

hearts: when we have *Communion* with God in the doctrine we contend *for*, then shall we be *Garrisoned* by the *grace* of God against all the *Assaults* of men. And without *this*, all our *contending* is as to our selves, of no value. What am I the better, if I can *dispute* that *Christ* is God, but have no *sense* or *sweetnesse* in my heart from hence, that he is a *God in Covenant* with my *soule*, what will it *availe* me to evince by *Testimonies* and *Arguments*, that he hath made *satisfaction* for sin, If through my *unbelief* the *wrath of God abides on me*, and I have no experience of my owne being made the *Righteousnesse of God in him*; If I find not in my *standing before God*, the *excellency* of having my *sins imputed* to him, and his *righteousnesse* imputed to me; will it be any Advantage to me in the *issue*, to *professe*, and *dispute* that *God* works the *conversion* of a sinner, by the *irresistable* grace of his spirit, If I was never *acquainted experimentally* with the deadnesse and utter *impotency* to good, that *opposition* to the *law* of *God* which is in my *own soule* by nature, with the *efficacy* of the exceeding *greatnesse of the power of God* in *quickning*, *enlightning*, *and bringing forth the fruits of obedience in me*. It is the *power* of *Truth* in the *heart* alone, that will *make* us *cleave* unto it indeed, in an hour of tempation. Let us then not think that we are any thing the *better* for our *conviction* of the *Truths* of the great doctrines of the *Gospel*, for which we contend with these men, unlesse we finde the *power* of the truths *abiding* in our own hearts, and have a continual experience of their *necessity*, and *excellency*, in our standing before God, and our Communion with him.

7 Doe not *look* upon these things, as things a *far* off, wherein you are *little concerned*: the *evill* is at the *doore*; there *is* not a *Citty*, a *Towne*, scarce a *Village* in *England*, wherein some of this *poyson* is not *poured forth*. Are not the *doctrines* of *free Will*, *Universal Redemption*, *Apostacy from Grace*, *Mutability of God*, of *denying the Resurrection* of the dead, with all the *fooliſh conceits* of many about *God* and Christ in this *nation*, ready to gather to *this head*.

Let us not deceive our selves; Sathan is a crafty Enemy: He yet *hovers* up and downe in the *lubricous* vaine *imaginations* of a confus'd *multitude*, whose tongues are so *divided* that they understand not *one* the other. I dare boldly say, that if ever he *settle* to a *stated opposition* to the Gospel, it will be in *Socinianisme*. The

Lord *rebuke him*, he is *busy* in, and by many, where little notice is taken of him: But of these things thus farre.

A particular account of the *Cause* and *Reasons* of my engagement in this business, with what I have *aymed* at in the ensuing *discourse*, you will find given in my Epistle to the University; so that the same things need not *here* also be delivered. The Confutation of Mr. *Biddles*, and *Smalcius* his *Catechisme*, commonly called the *Racovian*, with the Vindication of all the *Texts* of Scripture, giving *Testimony* to the Deity of Christ throughout the *Old* & *New* Testament, from the perverse *Glosse* & *interpretations* put upon them by *Hugo Grotius*, in his *annotations* on the Bible, with those also which concerne his *satisfaction*, and on the occasion hereof, the Confirmation of the most *important* Truths of the Scripture, about the *Nature* of God, the *Person* of Christ, and the Holy Ghost, the offices of Christ, &c: hath been in my designe. With what *mind and intention*, with what *love* to the Truth, with what *dependance* on God for his *presence* and assistance, with what *earnestnesse of supplication* to enjoy the fruit of the Promise of our dear *Lord Jesus*, to lead me into *all Truth* by his blessed Spirit, I have gone through this worke, the Lord knowes. I only know, that in every *particular* I have come *short* of my duty *therein*, that a *review* of my paths and paines, would yeeld me very little refreshment, but that I know in whom I have believed, and am perswaded, *that even concerning this also, he will remember me for Good, and spare me according to the greatnesse of his mercy*. And what ever becomes of this weak endeavour before the Lord, yet he hath made with me an everlasting Covenant, ordered in all things and sure: And this is all my salvation, and all my desire, although he make it not to grow: what is *performed*, is submitted humbly to the *judgment* of them to whom this adress is made. About the *thoughts* of others, or *any* such, as by *envy*, interest, curiosity, or faction, may be swayed or byassed, I am not solicitous. If any *benefit* redound to the *Saints* of the most High, or any that belong to the *purpose of God's love* be advantaged, *enlightened*, or *built* up in their *most holy faith* in the least, by what is here delivered, I have my reward.

Mr B's Preface to his *Catechisme.*

I Have often wondered and complained that there was no Catechism yet extant, (that I could ever see, or hear of) from whence one might learne the true grounds of the Christian Religion, as the same is delivered in the Holy Scripture, all Catechisms generally being so stuffed with the suppositals and traditions of men, that the least part of them is derived from the Word of God. For when Councells, Convocations and Assemblies of *Divines*, justling the sacred writers out of their place in the Church, had once framed Articles and Confessions of Faith, according to their own fancies and interests, and the Civil Magistrate had by his Authority ratified the same, all Catechisms were afterwards fitted to those Articles and Confessions, & the Scripture either wholly omitted, or brought in only for a shew, not one quotation amongst many being a whit to the purpose, as will soone appeare to any man of judgment, who taking into his hand the said Catechismes, shall examine the texts alledged in them; for if he do this diligently and impartially, he will find the Scripture, and those Catechismes to be at so wide a distance one from another, that he will begin to question whether the Catechists gave any heed at all to what they wrote, and did not onely themselves refuse to make use of their Reason, but presume that their Readers also would do the same. In how miserable a condition then (as to spirituall things) must Christians generally needs be, when thus trained up, not, (as the Apostle adviseth) *in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*, but in the suppositals and traditions of men, having little or no assurance touching the reallity of their Religion! Which some observing, and not having the happinesse to light upon the Truth, have quite abandoned all Piety whatsoever, thinking there is no firme ground whereon to build the same. To prevent which mischiefe in time to come, by bringing men to a certainety, (I mean such men as owne the divine Authority of the Scripture) and withall to satisfie the just and pious desires of many, who would faine understand the truth of our Religion, to the end they might not only be built up themselves, but also instruct their Children and Families in the same, I have here (according to the understanding I have gotten by continuall meditation on the Word of God) compiled a Scripture Catechism, wherein I bring the Reader to a sure and certain knowledg of the chiefest things pertaining both to belief and practice, whilest I my selfe assert nothing (as others have done before me) but only introduce the Scripture faithfully uttering its owne assertions, which all Christians confesse to be of undoubted truth. Take heed therefore whosoever thou art that lightest on this Booke, and there readest things quite contrary to the doctrines

that passe currant amongst the generality of Christians,)for I confesse most of the things here displayed, have such a tendency) that thou fall not foul upon them, for thou canst not do so without falling foul upon the Holy Scripture it selfe, inasmuch as all the Answers through out the whole Catechism are faithfully transcribed out of it, and rightly applied to the Questions, as thou thyselfe mayst perceive if thou make a diligent inspection into the severall texts withall their circumstances. Thou wilt perhaps here reply, that the texts which I have cited: do indeed in the letter hold forth such things as are contrary to the doctrines commonly received amongst Christians, but they ought to have a mysticall or figurative interpretation put upon them, and then both the Doctrines and the texts of Scripture will suit well enough. To which I answer, that if we once take this liberty to impose our mysticall or figurative interpretations on the Scripture, without expresse warrant of the Scripture it selfe, we shall have no setled beliefe, but be liable continually to be turned aside by any one that can invent a new mysticall meaning of the Scripture, there being no certaine rule to judge of such meanings, as there is of the literall ones: nor is there any error, how absurd & impious soever, but may on such termes be accorded with the Scripture. All the abominable Idolatries of the Papists, all the superstitious Fopperies of the Turkes, all the licentious Opinions & practices of the Ranters, may by this means be not only paliated, but defended by the Word of God. Certainly might we of our own heads figuratively interpret the Scripture, when the letter is neither repugnāt to our senses, nor to the scope of the respective texts, nor to a greater number of plain texts to the contrary (for in such cases we must of necessity admit figurs in the sacred Volume, as wel as we do in profane ons otherwise both they & it will clash with themselves, or with our senses which the Scripture it selfe intimates to be of infallible certainty, see 1 *Joh.* 1. 2, 3.) might we I say at our pleasure impose our Figures and Allegories on the plain words of God, the Scripture would in very deed be, what some blasphemously affirm it to be a *Nose of Wax*. For instance, it is frequently asserted in the Scripture, that God hath a similitude or shape, hath his place in the Heavens, hath also affections or passions, as love, hatred, mercy, anger, and the like, neither is any thing to the contrary delivered there, unlesse seemingly in certaine places which neither for number, nor clearenesse are comparable unto those of the other side. Why now should I depart from the letter of the Scripture in these particulars, and boldly affirme with the generality of Christians, (or rather, with the generality of such Christians only, as being conversant with the false Philosophy that reigneth in the Schools, have their understandings perverted with wrong notions) that God is without a shape, in no certain place, and uncapable of affections? Would not this be to use the Scripture like a Nose of Wax, and when of it selfe it looketh any way, to turne it aside at our pleasure? And would not God be so farre from speaking to our capacity in his Word, (which is the usuall Refuge of the Adversaries, when in these and the like matters concerning God, they are pressed with the plain words of the Scripture) as that he would by so doing render us altogether uncapable of finding out his meaning, whilst he spake one thing, and understood the cleane contrary? Yea would he not have

taken

taken the direct course to make men substitute an Idol in his stead, (for the Adversaries hold, that to conceive of God as having a shape, or affections or being in a certaine place, is Idolatry) if he described himselfe in the Scripture otherwise then indeed he is, without telling us so much in plaine termes, that we might not conceive amisse of him? Thus we see, that when sleep, which plainely argueth weakenesse and imperfection, had been ascribed to God *Psal.* 44. 23. The contrary is sayd of him, *Psal.* 121. 4. Againe when wearinesse had been attributed to him, *Isa.* 1. 14. The same is expressly denyed of him *Isa.* 40. 28. And would not God (thinke ye) have done the like in those forementioned things, were the case the same in them, as in the others? This consideration is so pressing, that a certaine Author, (otherwise a very learned and intelligent man) perceiving the weight thereof, and not knowing how to avoid the same, tooke up (though very unluckily) one erroneous tenet to maintaine another, telling us in a late booke of his intituled *Conjectura Cabalistica, that for Moses, by occasion of his writings, to let the Jewes entertaine a conceite of God as in humane shape, was not any more a way to bring them into Idolatry, then by acknowledging man to be God, as* (saith he) *our Religion does in Christ.* How can this consist even with consonancy to his own Principles, whilst he holds it to be false that God hath any shape, but true that Christ is God? For will a false opinion of God no sooner lead men into Idolatry, then a true opinion of Christ? But it is no marvell; that this Author, & other learned men with him, entertaine such conceits of God and Christ, as are repugnant to the currēt of the Scripture, whilst they set so high a rate on the sublime indeed but uncertain notions of the Platonists, & in the mean time slight the plain but certain letter of the Sacred Writers, as being far below the Divine Majesty & written only to cõply with the rude apprehensions of the vulgar, unles by a mysticall interpretation they be serued up to Platonism. This is the stone at which the Pride of learned men hath caused them continually to stumble, namely to think that they can speak more wisely & worthily of God, then he hath spoken of himselfe in his word. This hath brought that more then Babylonish confusion of language into the Christian Religion, whilst men have framed those horrid and intricate expressions, under the colour of detecting and excluding Heresies, but in truth to put a baffle on the simplicity of the Scripture, and usher in Heresies, that so they might the more easily carry on their worldly designes, which could not be effected but through the ignorance of the people nor the people brought into ignorance, but by wrapping up Religiõ in such mostrous termes, as neither the people nor they themselves that invented them, (or at least tooke them from the invention of others) did understand. Wherefore there is no possibility to reduce the Christian Religion to its primitive integrity, a thing, though much pretended yea bosted of in Reformed Churches, yet never hitherto sincerely endeavoured much lesse effected, in that men have by severe penalties been hindered to reforme Religion beyond such a stint, as that of *Luther*, or at most that of *Calvin*) but by cashiring those many intricate terms, and devised forms of speaking, imposed on our Religion, and by wholly betaking our selves to the plainnesse of the Scripture. For I have long since observed, (and finde my observation to be true and certaine) that when to ex-

presse matters of Religion men make use of words and Phrases unheard of in the Scripture, they slily under them couch false doctrines, and obtrude them on us: for without question the Doctrines of the Scripture can be so aptly explained in no language as that of the Scripture it selfe. Examine therefore the expressions *of Gods being infinite and incomprehensible, of his being a simple Act, of his subsisting in three persons, or after a threefold manner, of a Divine Circumincession, of an Eternall Generation, of an Eternall Procession, of an Incarnation, of an Hypostaticall Union, of a Communication of Properties, of the Mother of God, of God dying, of God made man, of Transubstantiation, of Consubstantiation, of Originall sinne, of Christs taking our nature on him, of Christs making satisfaction to God for our sinnes, both past, present and to come, of Christs fulfilling the Law for us, of Christs being punished by God for us, of Christs merits, or his meritorious obedience both active & passive, of Christs purchasing the kingdom of Heaven for us, of Christs enduring the wrath of God, yea the paines of a damned man, of Christs rising from the dead by his own power, of the Ubiquity of Christs Body, of apprehending and applying Christs Righteousnesse to our selves by Faith, of Christs being our Surety, of Christs paying our debts, of our sinnes imputed to Christ, of Christs righteousnesse imputed to us, of Christs dying to appease the wrath of God, and reconcile him to us of infused Grace, of free Grace, of the world of the Elect, of irresistible workings of the Spirit in bringing men to believe, of carnall reason, of Spirituall desertions, of Spirituall incomes, of the Outgoings of God, of taking up the Ordinance, &c.* And thou shalt find, that as these formes of speech are not owned by the Scripture, so neither the things contained in them. How excellent therefore was that advice of *Paul* to *Timothy* in his second Epistle to him, chap. 1.13. *Hold fast the forme of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus?* For if we once let go those formes of sound words learned from the Apostles, and take up such as have been coined by others in succeeding Ages, we shall together part with the Apostles Doctrine, as wofull experience hath taught us. For after *Constantine* the Great, together with the Councell of *Nice*, had once deviated from the language of the Scripture, in the businesse touching the Sonne of God, calling him *coessentiall* with the Father, this opened a gap for others afterwards, under a pretence of guarding the Truth from Hereticks, to devise new termes at pleasure, which did by degrees so vitiate the chastity and simplicity of our Faith delivered in the Scripture, that there hardly remained so much as one point thereof sound & entire. So that as it was wont to be disputed in the Schooles, whether the old ship of *Theseus* (which had in a manner been wholly altered at sundry times by the accession of new pieces of timber upon the decay of the old) were the same ship it had been at first, and not rather another by degrees substituted in the stead thereof: in like manner there was so much of the primitive truth worne away by the corruption that did by little and little overspread the generallity of Christians, and so many errors in stead thereof tacked to our Religion at severall times, that one might justly question whether it were the same Religion with that which Christ and his Apostles taught, and not another since devised by men, and put in the roome thereof. But thanks be to God through our Lord Jesus Christ, who amidst the universall corruption of our Religion, hath preserved his written word entire, (for had men corrupted it, they would

would have made it speake more favourably in behalfe of their lusts and worldly interests, then it doth) which word if we with diligence & sincerity pry into, resolving to embrace the doctrine that is there plainely delivered, though all the world should set it selfe against us for so doing, we shall easily discerne the Truth, and so be enabled to reduce our Religion to its first principles. For thus much I perceive by mine owne experience, who being otherwise of no great abilityes, yet setting my selfe with the aforesaid resolution for sundry yeers together upon an Impartiall search of the Scripture, have not only detected many errours, but here presented the Readers with a body of Religion, exactly transcribed out of the word of God; which body whosoever shall well ruminate and digest in his mind, may by the same method, wherein I have gon before him, make a farther enquiry into the Oracles of God, and draw forth whatsoever yet lyes hid, and being brought to light will tend to the accomplishment of Godlinesse amongst us, for at this only all the Scripture aimeth: the Script. which al men, who have thorowly studyed the same, must of necessity be enamored with as breathing out the meere wisdome of God & being the exactest Rule of a holy life, (which all Religions whatsoever confesse to be the way unto Happinesse) that can be imagined, and whose Divinity will never even to the worlds end be questioned by any, but such as are unwilling to deny their worldly lusts, and obey the pure and pefect precepts thereof. Which obedience whosoever shall performe, he shall not only in the life to come, but even in this life be equall unto Angels.

JOHN BIDDLE.

M. BIDDLE'S *Preface briefly EXAMINED.*

IN the entrance of Mr B's Preface he tells the Reader (very modestly) *that he could never yet see, or heare of a Catechisme* (although I presume he had seene, or heard at least of one or two written by *Faustus Socinus*, (though not compleated) of one by *Valentine Smalcius*, commonly called the *Racovian Catechisme*, from whence many of his questions and Answers are taken: and of an Exposition of the *Articles of Faith* in the *Creed*, called the Apostles, in way of *Catechisme* by *Jonas Schlichtingius*, published in French An. 1646. in Latine An. 1651)

himselfe) M. *Biddle* tells you, *have written with so much oscitancy and contempt of the Scripture, that a considering man will question whether they gave any heed to what they wrote themselves, but refused to make use of their Reason, and presumed others would do so also.* And so you have the summe of his Judgment concerning all other Catechismes besides his owne, that he hath either seene or heard of. *They are all fitted to confusion of Faith, composed according to the fancyes & interests of men, written without attending to the Scripture or quoating it to any purpose, their Authors (like mad men) not knowing what they wrote, and refusing to make use of their Reason that they might soe doe,* and this is the *modest humble* entrance of Mr B. Preface.

All that have gon before him were knaves, fooles, Ideotts, mad men. The proofe of these Assertions, you are to expect. When a Philosopher pressed *Diogenes* with this Sophisme, *What I am, thou art not, I am a man, therefore thou art not;* He gave him no other answer, but begin with me and the conclusion will be true. M. *B.* is a Master of Arts; And knew doubtlesse, that such Assertions as might be easily turned upon himselfe, are of no use to any, but those who have not ought else to say. Perhaps M. B. speakes only to them of the same mind with him; and then indeed as *Socrates* d said, it was no hard thing to commend the *Athenians* before the *Athenians*, but to commend them before the *Lacedemonians* was difficult; no more is it any great undertaking to commend men found in the Faith unto *Socinians*, before others it will not prove so easy.

d Οὐ χαλεπὸν Ἀθηναίους ἐν Ἀθηναίοις ἐπαινεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἐν Λακεδαιμονίοις. *Socrat. apud Plat. in menexem. Cit. Arist. Rhetor. lib. 3 cap. 14.*

It is not incumbent on me, to defend any, much lesse all the Catechismes that have bin written by Learned men of the Reformed Religion. That there are Errors in some, mistakes in others, that some are more cleare, plaine, and Scripturall, then others, I grant. All of them may have, have had their use in their kind. That in any of them there is any thing taught, inconsistent with Communion with God, or inevitably tending to the Impairing of Faith, and Love, M. B. is not I presume such a φιλόπονος, as to undertake to demonstrate. I shall only adde, that notwithstanding the vaine plea, of having given all his Answers in the expres words of Scripture (whereby with the foolish bird he hides his head, from the fouler, but leaves his whole monstrous body visible,) The teaching part of his Catechisme being solely in the insinuating, ensnaring captious Questions thereof

thereof, leading the understanding of the Reader, to a misaprehension and misaplication of the words of the Scripture (ie being very easy to make up the grossest blasphemy Imaginable out of the words of the Scripture it selfe) I never found, saw, read, or heard of any, so grosly perverting the Doctrine of the Scripture, concerning God, and all his wayes, as these of Mr *B.* doe: (for in sundry particulars, they exceed those mentioned before of *Socinus*, *Smalcius*, *Schlichtingius*, which had justly gotten the repute of the worst in the world;) & for an account of my Reason of this perswasion, I referre the Reader, to the ensuing Considerations of them.

This then being the sad estate of Christians, so misinformed by such vile *Varlets*, as have so fouly deceived them, and misled them, as above mentioned, what is to be don, and what course to be taken, to bring in light into the world, and to deliver men from the the sorrowfull condition, whereinto they have been Catechised? For this end he tells the Reader, doth e he shew himselfe to the world, (Θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς) to undeceive them, and to bring them out of all their *wanderings unto some certainty of Religion.* This he discourses *pag.* 4, 5. The Reasons he gives you of this undertaking are two, 1. *To bring men to a certainty.* 2. *To satisfie the pious desires of some, who would faine know the truth of our Religion.* The way he fixes on, for the compasing of the end proposed, is 1. *By asserting nothing*, 2. *By introducing the plaine texts of Scripture to speake for themselves:* Each breifely may be considered.

e *Multa passim ab ultimâ vetustate vitia admissa sunt, quæ nemo præter me indicabit.* Scalig.

1. What fluctuating persons are they, not yet come to any certainty in Religion, whō M. B. intends to deale with all? Those, for the most part, of them who seeme to be intended in such undertakings, are fully perswaded from the Scripture, of the Truth of those things, wherein they have ben instructed. Of these, some (I have heard) have been unsetled by M. *B.* but that he shall ever settle any (there being no consistency in errour or falsehood) is impossible. M. *B.* knowes, there is no one of the Catechists he so decryes, but directs them whom he so instructs, to the Scriptures, and settles their Faith on the Word of God alone: though they labour to helpe their Faith and understanding, by opening of it, whereunto also they are called. I feare M *B*'s. certainty will at length appeare to be *Scepticisme*; and his

f *Hoc illis negotium est, non ethnicos convertendi, sed nostros evertendi.* Tertul. de præscrip. ad Hæ.

setling of men, to be their unsetling; that his f conversions are from the Faith; and that in this very booke he aimes more to acquaint men with his Questions, then the Scriptures Answers; But he sayes

2. Those whom he aymes to bring to this certainty, *are such as would faine understand the truth of our Religion.* If by *our Religion* he meanes the Religion of himselfe, and his followers (or rather Masters) the *Socinians*, I am sorry to heare that g any are so greedy of its acquaintance. Happily this is but a pretence; such as his predecessors in this worke have commonly used. For *understanding the truth* of it, they will finde in the issue what an endlesse worke they have undertaken. Who can make that straight, which is crooked; or number that which is wanting? If by *our Religion* he meanes the *Christian Religion*, It may well be inquired, who they are with their just and pious desires, who yet understand not the Truth of Christian Religion? That is, that it is the only true Religion; When we know these *Turks, Jewes, Pagans*, which Mr *Biddle* hath to deale with all, we shall be able to judge of what Reason he had to labour to satisfie their *Just and pious desires.* I would also willingly be informed how they came to so high an advancement in our Religion, as to desire to be *brought up in it, and to be able to instruct others*, when as yet they doe not understand the truth of it, or are not satisfyed therein. And

g *Expressêre id nobis vota multorum, multæq; eriam â remotissimis orbis partibus ad nos transmissæ preces.* Præfat. ad Cat. Rac.

Nam Rex Seleucus me opere oravit maximo, ut sibi latrones togerem & conscriberem. Pyrgopol. in Plaut. Mil. Glo.

3. As these are Admirable men, so the way he takes for their satisfaction is admirable also; that is, by asserting nothing; He that asserts nothing, proves nothing, for that which any one proves, that he asserts; Intending then to bring men to a *certainty who yet understand not the truth of our Religion*, he *asserts* nothing, proves nothing, (as is the manner of some) but leaves them to themselves: A most compendious way of teaching, (for whose attainement Mr *B.* needed not to have been Master of Arts) if it proves effectuall. But by not asserting, it is evident M. B. intends not silence; He hath said too much to be so interpreted. Only what he hath spoken, he hath done it in a *sceptical* way of inquirie; wherein though the intendment of his mind be evident, and all his Queries may be easily resolved into so many propositions or Assertions, yet as his words lye, he supposes he may speake truly, that he *asserts* nothing. Of the truth then of

this

this Assertion, that he *doth not assert any thing*, the Reader will judge. And this is the path to Atheisme which of all others is most trod and beaten in the dayes wherein we live. A liberty of judgement is pretended, and Queries are proposed, untill nothing certaine be left, nothing unshaken. But

4. *He introduces the Scripture, Faithfully uttering its owne Assertions*; If his owne testimony concerning his faithfull dealing, may be taken, this must passe. The expresse words of the Scripture, I confesse are produced; but as to M. *B*'s faithfulln esse in their production, I have sundry exceptions to make.

As 1. That by his leading Questions, and Application of the Scripture to them, he hath utterly perverted the Scope and Intendment of the places urged. Whereas he pretends not to *assert* or *explaine* the Scripture, he most undoubtedly restraines the signification of the places by him alleadged, unto the precise scope, which in his *sophisticall Queries* he hath included; and in such a way of proceedure, what may not the *Serpentine* wits of men, pretend to a confirmation of, from Scripture, or any other Book, that hath been written about such things, as the Inquiries are made after. It were easy to give innumerable instances of this kind: but we feare God, and dare not to make bold with him or his word.

2 M. *B.* pretending to give an account of the chiefest things *pertaining* to beliefe and practice, doth yet propose no question at all, concerning many of the most important Heads of our Religion, and whereunto the Scripture speaks fully, and expressely; or proposes his thoughts in the *negative*, leading on the Scriptures, from whence he makes his objections to the grand Truths he opposeth, concealing (as was said) the delivery of them in the Scripture, in other places innumerable: so insinuating to the men *of just and pious desires*, with whom he hath to doe, that the Scripture is silent of them. That this is the mans way of proceedure, in reference to *the Deity of Christ*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, the *Satisfaction and Merit of Christ*, the *corruption of Nature*, and *Efficacy of Grace*, with many other most important heads of Christian Religion, will be fully manifest in our Considerations of the severall particulars, as they shall occurre, in the method wherein by him they are handled.

3. What can be concluded of the mind of God, in the Scrip-

ture, by cutting of any place, or places of it, from their dependence, connection, and tendency, catching at those words which seeme to confirme what we would have them so to doe, (whether in the proper order, wherein of God they are set and fixed, they doe in the least cast an eye towards the *Thesis*, which they are produced to confirme or no) might easily be manifested, by innumerable instances, were not the vanity of such a course, evident to all. On the consideration of these few exceptions to M. *B*'s way of proceedure, it will easily appeare, what little advantage he hath given him thereby, and how unjust his pretence is, which by this course he aimes to prevaile upon men withall. This he opens p. 6. *none* (saith he) *can fall upon the things contained in his Catechisme* (which he confesseth to be quite contrary to the Doctrine that passeth *current among the generality of Christians*) *as they are here displayed, because the Answers are transcribed out of the Scriptures*. But M. *B*. may be pleased to take notice, that the *displaying* (as he calls it) of his Doctrines, is the worke of his Questions, and not of the words of Scripture, produced to confirme them; which have a sence cunningly and subtilly imposed on them, by his queries, or are pointed and restrained to the things, which in the place of their delivery, they looke not towards in any measure. We shall undoubtedly find in the processe of this businesse, that M. *B*'s questions being found guilty of treason against God, will not be allowed Sanctuary in the Answers which they labour to creepe into, & that they disclaiming their protection, they may be pursued, taken, and given up to the iustice and severity of Truth, without the least profanation of their holinesse. A murtherer may be plucked from the hornes of the Altar.

Nor is that the only Answer insisted on, for the removall of M. *B*'s *Sophistry*, which he mentions *pag.* 7. and pursues it for three or foure leaves onward of his Preface: *viz. That the Scriptures which he urgeth, doe in the letter hold out such things as he alledgeth them to prove, but yet they must be figuratively interpreted.* For (M. B's *Mysticall* sence) I know not what he intends by it, or by whom, it is urged.) This is applyable solely to the places he produceth for the description of God & his Attributes, concerning whom, that some expressions of Scripture, are to be so interpreted, himselfe confesses *pag.* 13. and we desire to take leave to inquire whether,

whether some others, beside what M.B. allowes, may not be of the same Consideration. In other things, for the most part, we have nothing at all to do with so much as the interpretation of the places he mentions, but only to remove the grosly Sophisticall insinuations of his Queries; For instance, when M.B. askes, *whether Christ Jesus were not a man or no*, & alledgeth expresse Scripture affirming that he was; we say not, that the Scripture must have a Figurative interpretation, but that M. B. is grosly *Sophisticall*, Concluding from the assertion of Christs *humane nature*, to the denyall of his *divine*; and desperately injurious to the persons with whom he pretends he hath to do, who as yet *understand not the truth of our Religion*, in undertaking to declare to them the speciall chiefe things of beliefe and practice, & hiding from them the things of the greatest moment to their Salvation, and which the Scripture speakes most plentifully unto; by not stating any question, or making any such Inquiry, as their Affirmation might be suited unto. The like Instance may be given in all the particulars, wherein M. B. is departed from the *Faith once delivered to the Saints*. His whole following discourse then, to the end of *pag.* 13th, wherein he decryes the answer to his way of proceedure, which himselfe had framed, he might have spared. It is true, we do affirm that there are figurative expressions in the Scripture (& M B dares not say the contrary) and that they are accordingly to be interpreted: Not that they are to have a *mysticall* sence put upon them, but that the literall sence is to be received, according to the direction of the Figure which is in the words. That those words of our *Saviour*, *this is my body*, are *figurative*, I suppose M. B. will not deny. Interpret them according to the figurative import of them, and that interpretation gives you the *Literall*, and not a mysticall sence, if such figures belong to speech and not to sence. That sence, (I Confesse) may be *spiritually* understood (then it is saving) or otherwise. but this doth not constitute different sences in the words, but only denote a difference in the understandings of men. But all this in *hypothesi* M. B. fully grants *pag.* 9. so that there is no danger by asserting it, to cast the least thought of uncertainty on the Word of God. But *pag.* 10. He gives you an instance, wherein this kind of interpretation must by no meanes be allowed, *viz. in the Scriptures Attributions of a shape, similitude*, (that is, of

Eyes, Ears, Hands, Feet) *unto God with passions & affections like unto us*; which that they are not *proper*, but *figuratively* to be interpreted, He tels you (*pag.* 10, 11, 12.) *those affirme, who are perverted by false Phylosophy, and make a nose of wax of the Scripture, which plainly affirms such things of God*. In what sence the expressions of Scripture intimated, concerning God, are necessarily to be received, and understood, the ensuing Considerations will enforme the Reader. For the present I shall only say, that I doe not know scarce a more unhappy instance, in his whole Book, that he could have produced, then this; wherein he hath been blasphemously Injurious unto God, and his holy Word. And herein we shall deale with him from Scripture it selfe, right Reason, [h] and the common consent of mankind. How remote our interpretations of the places by him quoated for his purpose, are from wresting the Scripture, or turning them aside from their purpose, scope and intendment, will also in due time be made manifest.

'Ο γὰρ πάσι δῆλοι, τοῦτο οὐ φαῦλον. 'Ο δ' ἀναιρῶν τοῦ πᾶσι τοῦτο πᾶσιν ἐ φανερὸν πάντως ἐναντία λέγει. *Arist. Nicom.* 3.

We say indeed (as M. B. observes) that in those kinds of expressions, *God condescendeth to accommodate his wayes and proceedings (not his Essence and being)* to our apprehensions, wherein we are very far from saying, that he *speaks one thing & intends the clean contrary*; but only that the thing that he ascribes to himselfe, for our understanding, and the accommodation of his proceedings, to the manner of men, are to be understood in him, and of them, [i] in that which they denote of perfection, & not in respect of that which is imperfect and weake. For instance, when God says, *his eyes run to and froe to behold the Sons of men*, we doe not say, that he *speaks one thing and understands another*, but only because we have our knowledge and acquaintance with things by our Eyes, looking up & down, therefore doth he, who hath not eyes of flesh, as we have, nor hath any need, to looke up and downe, to acquaint himselfe with *them*, all whose wayes are in his own hand, nor can without blasphemy be supposed to looke from one thing to another, chose to expresse his knowledge of, and intimate acquaintance with all things here below, in, and by his own infinite understanding, in the way so suited to our apprehensiō. Neither are these kinds of expression in the least an occasion of *Idolatry*, or doe give advantage to any, of creating any shape of God in their imaginations; God having plainly and clearely in the same word of his, wherein these expressions are used

[i] *Quæ dicuntur de Deo Ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, intelligenda sunt Θεοπρεπῶς.*

used, discovered *that* of himselfe, his Nature, Being, and Properties, which will necessarily determine, in what sence those expressions are to be understood; as in the consideration of the severall particulars in the ensuing Discourse, the Reader will find evinced. And we are yet of the mind, that to conceive of God, as a Great Man, with Mouth, Eyes, Hands, Leggs &c. in a proper sence, *sitting in Heaven*, shut up there, *troubled, vexed, moved* up and down with sundry *passions*, perplexed about the things that are to come to passe, which he knowes not, which is the notion of God, that M. B. labours to deliver the world from their darkenesse withall, is grosse Idolatry: whereunto the *Scripturall* Attributions unto God mentioned, give not the least countenance, as will in the progresse of our Discourse more fully appeare. And if it be true which M. *B.* intimates, that *things implying imperfection* (speaking of sleep, and being weary) *are not properly Attributed to God*, I doubt not but I shall easily evince, that the same line of refusall, is to passe over the *visible shape*, and *turbulent affections*, which are by him ascribed to him; but of these more particularly in their respective places.

But he addes, *That this consideration is so pressing*, (*pag.* 13, 14.) *that a certaine learned Author, in his Book entituled* [*Conjectura Cabalistica*] *affirmes, that for Moses by occasion of his writing to let the Jewes entertaine a conceit of God as in humane shape, was not any more a way to bring them unto Idolatry, then by acknowledging man to be God, as our Religion doth in part*: which plea of his M. *B.* exagitates in the pages following. That *Learned Gentleman*, is of Age and Ability to speake for himselfe; for mine owne part, I am not so cleare in what he affirmes, as to undertake it for him; though otherwise very ready to serve him, upon the account which I have of his worth, and Abilityes; though I may freely say, I suppose they might be better exercised, then in such *Cabalisticall Conjectures*, as the booke of his, pointed unto, is full of. But who am I that judge another: we must every one give an account of himselfe and his labours to God: and the fire shall try our workes of what sort they are; I shall not desire to make too much worke for the fire. For the present I deny that *Moses* in his writings, doth give any occasion to entertaine a Conceit of God, as one of an *humane shape*. Neither did the *Jewes* ever umble into Idolatry, on that account. They sometimes indeed,

changed

Changed their Glory, for that which was not God. But whilst they worshipped that God, that revealed himselfe by *Moses*, *Jehovah*, *Ehejeh*, it doth not appeare, that ever they entertained in their thoughts any thing but *purum numen*, a most simple, Spirituall, Eternal being, as I shall give a farther account afterwards. Though they intended to worship *Jehovah* both in the Calfe in the Wildernes, and in those at *Bethel*, yet that they ever entertained any thoughts, that God had such a shape, as that which they framed to worship him by, is madnesse to imagine. For though *Moses* sometimes speakes of God in the condescention before mentioned, expressing his *Power* by his Arme, and *Bow*, and *Sword*; his knowledge and understanding, by his *Eye*; yet he doth in so many places caution them, with whom he had to do, of entertaining any thoughts of any bodily *similitude* of God, that by any thing delivered by him, there is not the least occasion administred, for the entertaining of such a conceit, as is intimated. Neither am I cleare in the *Theologicall predication*, which that learned Person hath chosen to parallell with the *Mosaicall* expressions of Gods *Shape*, and similitude, concerning *man being God*; Though we acknowledge him who is man, to be God, yet we doe not acknowledge *man* to be God. Christ under this *reduplication*, *as man*, is not a person, and so not *God*. To say that man is God, is to say, that the Humanity, and Deity are the same; what ever he is as man, he is upon the account of his being man; Now that he who is man, is also God, though he be not God, uppon the account of his being man, can give no more occasion to Idolatry, then to say that God is Infinite, Omnipotent. For the expression it selfe, it being in the concrete, it may be salved by the communication of propertyes: but as it lyes, it may possibly be taken in the abstract, and so is simply false. Neither do I judge it safe to use such expressions, unlesse it be when the grounds and reasons of them are assigned. But that M. *B.* should be offended with this Assertion, I see no Reason. Both he and his associates affirme, that Jesus Christ as man, (being in Essence and nature nothing but man) is made a God, and is the object of Divine worship, or Religious Adoration on that account. I may therefore let passe M. B's following Harangue against mens *Phylosophicall speculations*, *desserting the Scripture in their contemplations of the nature of God*; *as though they could speake*

more

more unworthily of God then he hath done of himself. For though it may easily be made appeare, that never any of the *Platonicall Philosophers* spake so unworthily of God, or vented such grosse carnall conceptions of him, as M. B. hath done, and the Gentleman of whom he speakes, be well able to judge of what he reades, and to free himselfe from being intangled in any of their notions, discrepant from the Revelation that God hath made of himselfe in his Word, yet we being resolved to try out the whole matter, and to put all the differences we have with M. B. to the tryall and Issue, upon the expresse Testimony of God himselfe, in his word, are not concerned in this discourse.

Neither have I any necessity to divert to the Consideration of his complaint, concerning *the bringing in of new expressions into Religion*; if he intends such, as whose substance or matter, which they do expresse, is not evidently and expressly found in the Scripture; What is the *Babylonish Language, what are the horrid and intricate Expressions*, which he affirmes *to be introduced, under a Colour of detecting and confuting Heresyes, but indeed to put a baste upon the simplicity of the Scripture*, he gives us an account of *pag.* 19. where we shall consider it, & them. In generall; words are but the figures of things. It is [k] not words and termes, nor Expressions, but Doctrines, and things, we inquire after. M. B. I suppose allowes expositions of Scriptures, or else I am sure, he *condemnes himself* in what he practises. His booke is in his owne thoughts, an Exposition of Scripture. That this cannot be done without varying the words and literall expressions thereof, I suppose will not be questioned. To expresse the same thing, that is contained in any place of Scripture, with such other words as may give light unto it, in our understandings, is to expound it. This are we called to. And the course of it is to continue, whilst Christ continues a Church upon the Earth. *Paul* spake nothing for the substance of the things he delivered, but what was written in the Prophets. That he did not use new Expressions, not to be found in any of the Prophets, will not be proved. But there is a twofold evill in these expressions. *(1.) That they are invented to detect and unfold Heresies, as is pretended.* If Heretickes begin first to wrest Scripture expressions, to a sence never received, nor contai-

[k] Οὐκ ἐν ἐχῳ, μᾶλλον ἐν διανοίᾳ κεῖ ἡ ἀλήθεια. Greg. Naz.

ned in them, it is surely lawfull for them, who are willing to *Contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints*, to cleare the mind of God, in his Word, by Expressions and termes suitable thereunto.[l] Neither have Hereticks carryed on their cause without the invention of new words and phrases.

l Ἦν ὅταν οὐκ ἦν. ὁμοούσιος. *Homo deificatus &c. dixit Arius.* 1. ὑον ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γεγενῆσθαι. 2. Εἶναί ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν &c. *Zozom. Hist. Eccles. lib.* 1. *cap.* 14. *p.* 215. *Theodor. Hist. l.* 1. *c.* 2. *pag.* 3. *Socrat. Scholast. Hist. lib.* 1. *c.* 3. &c. Οὐκ ἔλεγε δὲ ἕνωσιν τὸν λόγον τῷ θεῷ πρὸς ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ δυὸ ὑποστάσεις ἔλεγε, καὶ διαίρεσιν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, καὶ θεὸν ἀπεκάλει ὁ Χριστὸν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐπ' ὠς ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ τῇ σχέσει, καὶ τῇ συνεφάφειᾳ τὸ ταυτὸ ἀλλήλοις ἀρέσκειν διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς φιλίας, *Leont. de Sect. de Nestorio.*

If any shall make use of any words, termes, phrases, and expressions, in, and about Religious things, requiring the imbracing, and receiving of those words, &c. by others, without examining either the Truth, of what, by those words, phrases, &c. they intend to signify, and expresse; or the Propriety of those expressions themselves, as to their accomodation for the signifying of those things, I plead not for them. It is not in the power of man, to make any word or expression, not found in the Scripture, to be *Canonicall*, [m] and for its own sake, to be imbraced and received. But yet, if any word or phrase, do expresly signify any Doctrine, or matter, contained in the Scripture, though the Word or Phrase it selfe, be not in so many letters found in the Scripture, that such words or phrases may not be used for the explication of the mind of God, I suppose will not easily be proved. And this we farther grant, that if any one shall scruple the receiving & owning of such expressions, so as to make them the way of professing that which is signifyed by them, and yet do receive the thing or Doctrine, which is by them delivered, for my part, I shall have no contest with him. For instance! the word ὁμοούσιος, was made use of by the first *Nicene Councell*, to expresse the unity of Essence and Being that is in the Father and Sonne, the better to obviate *Arius* and his followers, with their ἦν ὅταν οὐκ ἦν, and the like formes of speech, no where found in Scripture, and invented on set purpose, to destroy the true and Eternall Deity of the Sonne of God. If now any man should scruple the receiving

m *Vide Cal. Institut.* lib. 1. cap. 13. *Alting. Theol. Elenct. loc. de Deo.*

ceiving of that Word, but withall should profes, that he believes *Jesus Christ* to be God equall to the father, one with him from the beginning, and doth not explaine himselfe by other termes, not found in the Scripture, *viz.* that he was made a God, and is one with the Father as to will, not Essence, and the like, he is like to undergoe neither trouble nor opposition from me. We know what troubles arose between the East and Westerne Churches, about the words *Hypostasis* and *Persona*, untill they understood on each side, that by these different Words, the same thing was intended; and that ὑπόστασις, with the *Greekes*, was not the same with *Substantia*, with the Latins; nor *Persona* with the Latins, the same with πρόσωπον among the Greekes, as to their application to the thing, the one & the other expressed by those termes. that such *monstrous termes are brought into our Religion, as neither they that invented them, nor they that use them, doe understand*, M.B. may be allowed to aver, from the measure he hath taken of all mens understandings, weighing them in his owne; and saying, *thus farre can they goe and no farther*; this they can understand, that they cannot. A prerogative, as we shall see in the processe of this busines, that he will scarsely allow to God himselfe, without his taking much paines and labour about it. I professe for my part, I have not as yet the least conviction fallen upon me, that M. B. is furnished with so large an understanding, what ever he insinuates of his *owne abilityes*, as to be allowed a *Dictator* of what any man can, or cannot understand. If his principle, or rather conclusion, upon which he limits the understandings of men, be this, what I cannot understand that no man else can, he would be desired to cõsider, that he is as yet but a young man, who hath not had so many Advãtages and helps, for the improving of his understanding, as some others have had; and besides, that there are some, whose Eyes are blinded by the God of this world, that they shall never see nor understand the things of God, yea and that God himselfe, doth thus oftentimes execute his vengeance on them, for detaining his Truth in unrighteousnesse.

But yet upon this acquaintance, which he hath with the measure of all mens understandings, he informes his Reader, that the *only way to carry on the Reformation of the Church, beyond what yet hath been done by Luther or Calvin, is by casheiring those many intri-*

cate termes and deviſed formes of ſpeaking, which he hath obſerved, ſlily to couch falſe Doctrines, and to obtrude them on us. And by the way, that this carrying on of Reformation, beyond the ſtint of Luther or Calvin, was never yet ſo much as ſincerely endeavoured. In the former paſſage, having given out himſelfe, as a Competent Judge of the *underſtandings* of all men, in this he proceeds to their *Hearts*. *The Reformation of the Church* (ſaith he) was never *ſincerely attempted, beyond the ſtint of Luther and Calvin*; attempted it hath been, but he knowes all the men, & their hearts ful well, who made thoſe attempts, and that they never did it *ſincerely*, but with *guile* and *Hypocryſy*; M. B. knowes who thoſe are that ſay; *with our tongue we will prevaile, our lips are our own.* To know the hearts of men, & their frame towards himſelfe, M. B. inſtructs us in his *Catechiſme*, that God himſelfe is forced to make tryall, and experiments. But for his owne part, without any great trouble he can eaſily pronounce of their ſincerity, or hypocriſy, in any undertaking; Low and vile thoughts of God, will quickly uſher in light, proud, and fooliſh thoughts concerning our ſelves. *Luther* and *Calvin*, were men whom God honoured above many in their Generation; and on that account, we dare not but do ſo alſo. That all Church Reformation, is to be meaſured by their line, that is, that no farther diſcovery of Truth in, or about, or concerning the wayes or workes of God, may be made, but what hath been made to them, and by them, was not that I know of, ever yet affirmed, by any in, or of any *Reformed Church in the World*; The truth is, ſuch attempts as this of M. *B's*, to overthrow all the foundations of Chriſtian Religion, to accomodate the Goſpell to the *Alcoran*, & ſubject all divine myſteries to the Judgement of that *Wiſdome*, which is *Carnall* & *ſenſuall*, under the faire pretence of carrying on the worke of Reformation, and diſcovering Truth from the Scripture, hath perhaps fixed ſome men to the meaſure they have received, beyond what Chriſtian Ingenuity, and the love of the truth requireth of them. A noble and free inquiry into the Word of God, with attendance to all wayes by him appointed, or allowed, for the Revelation of his mind, with reliance on his gratious Promiſe of *leading us into all truth* by his holy & bleſſed Spirit, without whoſe ayde, guidance, direction light, & aſſiſtance, we can neither know, underſtand, nor receive the things that are of God, neither captivated to the traditions of our Fathers, for whoſe labour and paines in the worke of

the

the Gospell, and for his presence with them, we dayly blesse the name of our God, neither yet carryed about with every wind of Doctrine, breathed or insinuated by the *Cunning slights of men, who lye in wait to deceive*, is that which we professe. What the Lord will be pleased to do with us, by, or in this frame, upon these principles, how, wherein we shall serve our Generation, in the Revelation of his mind and will, is in his hand, and disposall. About using, or casting off Words, and Phrases, formerly used to expresse any Truth, or doctrine of the Scripture, we will not contend with any; provided the things themselves signifyed by them, be retained. This alone makes me indeed, put any value on any word, or expression, not *ρητῶς* found in the Scripture; namely, my observation that they are questioned & rejected by none, but such, as by their rejection, intend & ayme at the removall of the truth it selfe, which by them is expressed, and plentifully revealed in the Word. The same care also was among them of old, having the same occasion administred.

1 Hence when *Valens* the *Arian* Emperour, sent *Modestus* his *Prætorian Præfect*, to perswade *Basil* to be an *Arian*, the man intreats him not to be so rigid, as to displease the Emperour, and trouble the Church *δι ὀλίγην δογμάτων ἀκείβειαν*, for an over strict observance of opinions; it being but one word, indeed one syllable, that made the difference, & he thought it not prudent, to stand so much upon so small a business; the holy man resolved, *πῶς θείοις λόγοις ἐντεθραμμένοι προΐδαι μὲν τὴν θείων δογμάτων ἀδε μίαν ἀνέξονται συλλαβήν*: however Children might be so dealt withall, *those who are bred up in the Scriptures, or nourished with the Word, will not suffer one syllable of Divine Truth to be betrayed*. The like attempt to this of *Valens* and *Modestus* upon *Basil*, was made by the [m] Arian Bishops at the Councell of *Ariminum*, who pleaded earnestly for the Rejection of one or two words, not found in the Scripture, laying on that plea much weight, when it was the eversion of the Deity of Christ which they intended & attempted. And by none, is there more strength & Evidence given to this observation, then by him, with whō I have now to do; who exclaiming against words and expressions, intends really, the subversion of all the most Fundamentall and substantiall Truths of the Gospell: And therefore having p. 19, 20, 21. reckoned up many Expressiōs which he dislike, condemnes

l Theodoret. Hist: Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 17. p. 126. Socrat: lib: 4. cap: 21, 22. Zozom: lib: 6 cap. 15, 16, 17.

m Theod: Hist. lib: 2. c. 18. Zozom: lib: 4 cap. 13. Nicoph. l: 9. cap. 39.

demnes, and would have rejected, most of them relating to the chiefest heads of our Religion, (though to his advantage, he cast in by the way two or three grosse figments) he concludes, *that as the formes of Speech by him recounted, are not used in the Scripture, no more are the things signifyed by them contained therein*. In the Issue then, all the quarrell is fixed upon the things thēselves, which if they were found in Scripture, the expressions insisted on, might be granted to suit them well enough. What need then all this long discourse about words and expressions, when it is the *things themselves* signifyed by them, that are the Abominations decryed? Now though most of the Things here pointed unto, will fall under our ensuing Considerations, yet because M. B. hath here cast into one heape, many of the Doctrines, which in the *Christian Religion* he opposeth, and would have renounced, it may not be amisse to take a short view of the most considerable instances, in our passage.

His first is, of *Gods being Infinite and incomprehensible*. This he condemnes, *name and thing*, that is, He sayes, *He is Finite, Limited*, of us to be comprehended. For those who say, he is Infinite and Incomprehensible; do say only, that he is not Finite, nor of us to be comprehended. What [n] advance is made towards the farther Reformation of the Church, by this new notion of M. *B's*, is fully discovered in the consideration of the 2d Chapter of his *Catechisme*.[o] And in this, as sundry other things, M. *B.* excells his Masters. The Scripture tells us expresly, that *He fills Heaven and Earth*; that the *Heaven, and the Heaven of Heavens cannot containe him*, that his presence is in *Heaven*, and *Hell*, and that his *Understanding is Infinite*, (which how the understanding of one that is Finite, may be, an Infinite understanding [] cannot comprehend) that he dwelleth in that *Light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see* (which to us is the descriptiō of *One Incomprehensible*) that he is Eternall; which we cannot comprehend. The like expressions are used of him in great abundance. Besides, if God be not Incomprehensible, we may search out his Power, Wisdome, and understanding to the utmost; For if we cannot, if it be not possible so to do, he is *Incomprehensible*. But, *Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to Perfection?* There is no searching of his understanding. If by our lines we suppose we can fathom the depth of the Essence,

n *Solent quidam miriones ædificari in ruinam.* Tertull. de Præsc. ad. Hæres.

o *Est autem hæc magnitudo ut ex iis intelligi potest, quæ de potentia & potestate Dei, item; de sapientia ejus dicta sunt, infinita & incomprehensibilis.* Crell. de Deo. seu de vera Rel. præfix. op. Voltel. lib. 1. c. 37. p. 273.

Essence, Omnipotency, Wisdome, and Understanding of God, I doubt not but we shall find our selves mistaken. Were ever any since the world began before, quarrelled withall, for asserting the Essence, and Being of God to be Incomprehensible? The *Heathen* p who affirmed, that the more he inquired, the more he admired, & the lesse he understood, had a more noble reverence of the Eternall q Being, which in his mind he conceived, then M.B. will allow us to entertaine of God. Farther! if God be not *Infinite*, He is circumscribed in some certaine place; if He be, is He there fixed to that place, or doth He move from it? If He be fixed there, how can He worke at a distance, especially such things as necessarily require Divine Power to their Production. If He move up and down, and journey as his occasions require, what a blessed injoyment of Himselfe in his own Glory hath He? But that this blasphemous figment, of Gods being limited, and confined to a certaine place, is really destructive to all the Divine perfections of the nature and Being of God, is afterwards demonstrated. And this is the first instance given by M.B. of the corruption of our Doctrine, which he rejects, *name and thing*, viz. *that God is Infinite and Incomprehensible:* and now whether this man be a *meer Christian*, or a *meere Lucian*, let the Reader judge.

That God is a *Simple Act*, is the next thing excepted against; and decryed, *name* and *thing*. In the Room whereof, that he is *compounded of matter and forme*, or the like, must be asserted. r Those who affirme God to be *a simple Act*, do only deny him to be compounded of diverse principles, & assert him to be alwayes actually in Being, Existence, & intent Operation. God sayes of himselfe, that his name is *Ehejeh*, & He is *I AM*, that is, a *simple Being*, Existing in, and of it selfe. And this is that, which is intended by the *simplicity* of the the nature of God, and his being a *simple Act*. The Scripture tells us he is Eternall: *I Am:* alwayes the same, and so never, what he was not ever. This is decryed, and in opposition to it, his being compounded,

p *Simonides apud Ciceronem* lib. 1. de nat. Deorum.

q *Vide passim quæ de Deo dicuntur, apud Aratum, Orpheum, Homerum, Asclepium, Platonem, Plotinum, Proclum, Psellum, Porphyrium, Jamblichum, Plinium, Tullium Senecam, Plutarchum, & quæ ex iis omnibus excerpsit* Eugub de Prim. Philos.

r *Via remotionis utendum est, in Dei consideratione: nam divina substantia sua immensitate excedit omnem formam, quam intellectus noster intelligit, unde ipsum nō possumus exacte cognosere quid sit, sed quid non sit.* Thom Con. Gentes lib. 1. cap. 14. *Merito dictum est a veteribus, potius in hac vita de Deo a nobis cognosci quid non sit, quam quid sit; ut enim cognoscamus quid Deus non sit, negatione nimirum aliqua, quæ propria sit divinæ essentiæ, satis est unica negatio dependentiæ &c.* Soncin. ad lib. 2. cap. 1. Metaph: Aristot: Qu: 2. Sec. 4.

and

and to being obnoxious to diſſolution, and his being *in potentia*, in a *diſpoſition*, and paſſive capacity to be what he is not, is aſſerted; for it is only to deny theſe things, that the terme, *ſimple*, is uſed, which he condemnes and rejects: And this is the ſecond inſtance that M. B. gives in the deſcription of his God, by his rejecting the received expreſſions concerning him who is ſo. He is *limited*, & of us to be *comprehended*; His Eſſence, & Being conſiſting of ſeverall Principles, whereby he is in a capacity of being what he is not. M.B. *ſolus habeto*. I will not be your Rivall in the favour of this God.

And this may ſuffice to this Exception of M. *Biddle*, by the way, againſt the *ſimplicity* of the being of God: yet becauſe he doth not directly oppoſe it afterwards, and the aſſerting of it, doth clearely evert all his following fond imaginations of the *Shape*, *Corporeity*, and *limitedneſſe* of the Eſſence of God, (to which end alſo, I ſhall in the conſideration of his ſeverall depravations of the Truth, concerning the nature of God, inſiſt upon it) I ſhall a little here divert to the explication of what we intend by the *ſimplicity of the Eſſence of God*, and confirme the truth of what we ſo intend, thereby.

As was then intimated before, though *ſimplicity* ſeeme to be a *poſitive* terme, or to denote ſomething *poſitively*, yet indeed it is a pure [f] negation; and *formally*, *immediately*, & properly, denyes *multiplication*, *compoſition*, & the like. And yet though this only it immediately denote, yet there is a moſt eminent perfection of the nature of God thereby ſignified to us, which is negatively propoſed, becauſe it is in the uſe of things that are proper to us, in which caſe we can only conceive, what is not to be aſcribed to God. Now not to inſiſt on the *metaphyſicall notions & diſtinctions* of *ſimplicity*, by the aſcribing of it to God, we do not only deny, that he is *compounded* of divers principles, really diſtinct, but alſo of ſuch as are *improper*, and not of ſuch a reall diſtance; or that he is compounded of any thing, or can be compounded with any thing whatever.

[f] Suarez: Metaph: Tom 2. diſput. 30. § 3. Cajetan: de Ente & Eſſen: cap: 2.

1. Then, that this is a *property of Gods Eſſence*, or Being, is manifeſt, from his *abſolute independence* and *firſtneſſe*, in being, and operation, which God often inſiſts upon, in the Revelation of himſelfe *Iſa.* 44. 6. *I am the firſt, & I am the laſt, & beſides me there is no God. Revel.* 1, 8. *I am Alpha, and Omega, the beginning, and the ending*

ending, saith the Lord, which is &c. so *Chap.* 21. 6. and *chap.* 22. 13. which also is fully asserted *Ro.* 11. 35, 36. *who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him againe, for of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to him be Glory for ever.* Now if God were of any causes, internall or externall, any principles, antecedent or superiour to him, he could not be so absolutely *First*, and *Independent*. Were he composed of parts, accidents, manner of being, he could not be *First*; For all these are before that which is of them, and therefore his Essence is absolutely *Simple*.

2. God is absolutely and perfectly *one* and the *same*, and nothing differs from his essence in it: *The Lord is one Lord, Deut.* 6. 4. *Thou art the same Ps.* 102. 27. And where there is an *absolute oneness*, and *sameness* in the whole, there is no *composition* by an union of extremes. Thus is it with God: his name is *I am, I am that I am, Exod.* 3. 14, 15. *Which is, Revel.* 1. 8. He then who is what he is, and whose all, that is in him, is himself, hath neither parts, accidents, principles, or any thing else, whereof his Essence should be *compounded*.

3. The *Attributes* of God, which alone seeme to be distinct things in the *Essence* of God, are all of them essentially the same with one another, and every one the same with the Essence of God, it selfe. For first, they are spoken one of another, as well as of God: as there is his *Eternall Power*, as well as his Godhead. And secondly, they are either *infinite*, and infinitely perfect, or they are not? if they are, then if they are not the same with God, there are more things *infinite* then *one*, and consequently more Gods; for that which is *absolutely infinite*, is absolutely Perfect, and consequently God. If they are not Infinite, then God knowes not himself, for a finite Wisdome, cannot know perfectly an Infinite being. And this might be farther confirmed, by the particular consideration of all kinds of *composition*, with a manifestation of the impossibility of their Atribution unto God: Arguments to which purpose, the Learned Reader knowes where to find in abundance.

4. Yea that God is, and must needs be a simple Act, (which expression M. B. fixes on for the rejection of it) is evident, from this one consideration, which was mentioned before: if he be not so, there must be some *potentiality* in God. What ever is, and

is not a simple Act, hath a possibility to be perfected by Act; if this be in God; he is not *perfect*, nor *all-sufficient:* every, composition whatever, is of *power and Act*, which if it be, or might have been in God, He could not be said to be immutable, which the Scripture plentifully witnesseth, that He is.

These are some few of the Grounds of this Affirmation of ours, concerning the *simplicity* of the Essence of God; which when M. *Biddle* removes and Answers, he may have more of them, which at present there is no necessity to produce.

From his *Being*, he proceeds to his *subsistence*, and expressly rejects his *subsisting in three Persons*, *name*, and *thing*. That this is no new attempt, no undertaking, whose Glory M. B. may arrogate to himself, is knowne. Hitherto God hath taken thought for his owne Glory, and eminently confounded the Opposers of the *Subsistence of his Essence in three distinct Persons*. Enquire of them that went before, and of the dealings of God with them of old, what is become of *Ebion*, *Cerinthus*, *Paulus Samosatenus*, *Theodorus Byzantinus*, *Photinus*, *Arius*, *Macedonius* &c. hath not God made their memory to rot, and their names to be an abomination to all Generations? How they once attempted to have taken possession of the Churches of God, making slaughter and havoke of all that opposed them, hath beene declared; but their place long since knows them no more. By the subsisting of God in any Person, no more is intended, then that Person's being God. If that Person be God, God subsists in that Person. If you grant the *Father* to be a *Person* (as the Holy Ghost expressly affirmes him to be, *Heb.* 1. 21.) and to be God, you grant, *God to subsist in that Person*; that is all which by that Expression is intended. The *Sonne* is God, or is not; To say He is not God, is to *begge* that which cannot be proved. If he be God, He is the *Father*, or He is another *Person?* If He be the *Father*, He is not the *Sonne*. That He is the *Sonne*, and not the *Sonne*, is sufficiently contradictory. If He be not the *Father*, as was said, and yet be *God*, he may have the same *nature* and *substance*, with the Father, (for of our God there is but one Essence, nature, or being) and yet be distinct from him. That distinction from him, is his *Personality*; that Property, whereby, and from whence, He is the *Sonne*. The like is to be said of the Holy Ghost; The thing then here denyed, is, that the

Sonne.

Sonne is God, or that the *Holy Ghost* is God. For if they are so, God must *subsist in three Persons*, of which more afterwards. Now is this not to be found in the Scriptures? Is there no Text affirming Christ to be God, to be one with the Father, or that the Holy Ghost is so? No Text saying, there are *three that beare witnesse in Heaven, and these three are one?* None ascribing divine *Perfections*, divine *Worship*, distinctly to either Sonne, or Spirit? And yet joyntly to one God? Are none of these things, found in the Scripture, that M. B. thinks with one blast, to demolish all these antient foundations, and by his bare Authority, to deny the Common Faith of the present Saints, and that wherein their Predecessors, in the Worship of God, are fallen asleepe in peace. The proper place for the consideration of these things, will farther manifest the Abomination of this bold Attempt, against the *Sonne* of *God*, and the *eternall Spirit*.

For the divine *Circumincession* mentioned in the next place. I shal only say that it is not at all in my intention to defend all Expressions, that any men have used (who are yet sound in the maine) in the unfolding of this great, tremendous Mystery of the blessed Trinity, and could heartily wish, that they had some of them, bin lesse curious in their inquiries, and lesse bold in their expressions. It is the thing it selfe alone, whose Faith I desire to owne and professe; and therefore shall not in the least labour to retaine and hold those Things or words, which may be left, or lost, without any prejudice thereunto.

Briefely, by the barbarous terme of *mutuall circumincession*, the Schoolemen understand that, which the Greeke Fathers called περιχώρησις, whereby they expressed that mystery, which Christ himselfe teaches us, *of his being in the Father, and the Father in him. John* 10. 38. and of the Fathers *remaining in him, and doing the workes he did, Ioh.* 14. 10. The *distinction* of the Persons, being not hereby taken away, but the *disjunction* of them, as to their nature and being.

The *Eternall Generation of the Sonne*, is in the Next place rejected; that he may be sure to cast down every thing, that lookes toward the Assertion of his Deity, whom yet the Apostle affirms, to be *God blessed for evermore Rom.* 9. 5. That the *Word, which in the beginning was*, (and therefore is) *God*, is the only begotten

Sonne of God, the Apostle affirmes *Joh.*1.14. That he is also the *only begotten Sonne of God*, we have other plentifull Testimonyes *Psal.*2.7. *John* 3. 16. *Acts* 13. 33. *Heb.* 1. 4, 5, 6. A sonne, so as in comparison of his sonship, the best of Sonnes by Adoption are Servants *Heb.*3.5,6. and so begotten, as to be an *only Sonne Joh.*1. 14. though begotten by Grace, God hath many *Jam.* 1.18. Christ then being begotten *of the Father*, hath his *Generation* of the Father; for these are the very same things, in words of a diverse sound; The only question here is, whether the Sonne have the Generation, so often spoken of, from *Eternity*, or in *time*? whether it be an *Eternall*, or a *temporall* Generation, from whence he is so said to be begotten. As Christ is a *Sonne*, so by him the *Worlds were made Heb.* 1. 2. So that surely he had his Sonship before he *tooke flesh in the fulnesse of time*. And when he had his Sonship he had his Generation. He is such a sonne, as by being partaker of that Name, he is exalted above *Angels Heb.* 1.5. And is the *first begotten, before he is brought into the World*, and therefore his goings forth, are said to be from the *Dayes of Eternity Micah.* 5. 2. and he had Glory *with the Father*, (as the Sonne) *before the world was John* 17.5. Neither is he said to be begotten of the Father, in respect of his incarnation, but conceived by the Holy Ghost, or formed in the wombe by him, of the substance of his mother, nor is he thence called the Sonne of God.

In briefe, if Christ be the Eternall Sonne of God, M. B. will not deny him to have had an *Eternall Generation*; if he be not, a Generation must be found out for him, sutable to the Sonship which he hath; of which Abomination in its proper place. This progresse have we made in Mr *B*'s Creed: He believes God to be *Finite*, to be by us *Comprehended*, *Compounded*: He believes there is no *Trinity* of *Persons* in the Godhead; that Christ is not the *Eternall Sonne of God*. The following parts of it are of the same kind. The *Eternall procession* of the Holy Ghost is nextly rejected. The Holy Ghost being constantly termed the *Spirit of God*, the *Spirit* of the *Father*, and the *Spirit of the Sonne*, (being also God, as shall afterwards be evinced,) and so partakes of the same nature with *Father and Sonnes* (the Apostle granting that God hath a *nature*, in his rejecting of them, who by *nature*, *are not Gods*,) is yet distinguished from them, and that *Eternally*, (as nothing is in the Deity that is not Eternall;) and being more-

over

over said ἐκπορεύεσθαι, or to *proceed*, and *goe forth* from the *Father* & *Sonne*, this expression of his Eternall Procession hath been fixed on: manifesting the *Property* whereby he is distinguished from Father and Sonne. The thing intended hereby is, that the Holy Ghost who is God, and is said to be of the Father, & the Sonne, is by that name, *of his being of them*, distinguished from them; and the denyall hereof, gives you one Article more of M.B's Creed, *viz.* that the *Holy Ghost is not God.* To what that expression of *proceeding* is to be accommodated, will afterwards be considered. The *Incarnation of Christ*, (the Deity and Trinity being dispatched) is called into Question, & rejected. By *Incarnation*, is meant, (as the word imports) a *taking of flesh*, (this is [t] variously by the Antients expressed, but the same thing still intended,) *or being made so:* The Scripture affirming, *that the Word was made flesh*, *Ioh:* 1.14. that *God was manifest in the flesh*, 1 *Tim:* 3.16. that *Christ took part of Flesh and Bloud*, *Heb:* 2.14. that *he took on him the Seed of Abraham*, *Heb:* 2.16. that he was *made of a Woman*, *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. *sent forth in the likenesse of sinfull flesh*, *Rom.* 8.3. *made like unto us in all things*, *Heb:* 2.17. We thought we might have been allowed to say so also, and that this Expression might have escaped with a lesse censure, then an utter Rejection out of *Christian Religion.* The Sonne of God, *taking flesh*, and so being made like to us, that he might be the Captaine of our salvation, is that which by this word, and that according to the Scripture, is affirmed, and which to increase the heape of former abominations, (or to carry on the work of Reformation beyond the stint of *Luther* or *Calvin*) is here by M.B. decryed.

[t] Ἐνσάρκωσις. ἐνσωμάτωσις. ἐνανθρώπησις. ἡ δεσποτικὴ ἐπιδημία. ἡ παρουσία. ἡ οἰκονομία. ἡ διὰ σαρκὸς ὁμιλία. ἡ δι' ἀνθρωπότητος φανέρωσις. ἡ ἔλευσις. ἡ κένωσις. ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ ἐπιφάνεια. ἡ συγκατάβασις. ἡ περιχώρησις.

Of the *Hypostaticall Union*, there is the same Reason: Christ, who as *concerning the flesh*, was of the Jewes, and is, *God to be blessed for ever, over all Ro.* 19.5. is one person: Being God to be blessed over all, that is, God by nature, (for such as are not so, and yet take upon them to be Gods, God will destroy,) and having *Flesh and Bloud*, as the Children have *Heb:* 2.14. that is, the same nature of man with Believers, yet being but one Person, one Mediator, one Christ, the Sonne of God, we say both these Natures of God and Man, are united in that one Person, *viz.* the Person of the Sonne of God. This is that which M. B. rejects, (now his hand is in) both *name and thing.* The truth is, all these things are but colourable advantages, wherewith he la-

boureth to amuze poore soules ; grant the Deity of Christ, and he knowes all these particulars will necessarily ensue; and whilest he denies the foundation, it is to no purpose to contend about any consequences or inferences whatever. And whither we have ground for the expression under present consideration; *Joh.*1.14,18. *Joh*:20.28. *Act.* 20.28. *Rom*:1.3,4. *Rom*:9. 5. *Gal*: 4.4. *Philip*:2.6,7,8,9. 1 *Tim*:3.16. 1 *Iohn* 1. 1,2. *Rev*:5.12,13, 14. with innumerable other Testimonies of Scripture may be considered. If the *Word*, the *Sonne of God*, was *made flesh, made of a Woman, took our nature*, wherein he was pierced, and wounded, and shed his bloud, and yet continues our *Lord*, and our *God*, *God blessed for ever*, esteeming it *no robbery to be equall with his Father*, yet being a *Person* distinct from him, being the *brightnesse of his Person*, we feare not to say, that the two Natures of God and Man, are united in one Person, which is the *Hypostaticall union* here rejected.

The [u] *Communication of Properties*, on which depend two or three of the following instances, mentioned by M. B. is a necessary consequent of the *Union* before asserted : and the thing intended by it, is no lesse clearely delivered in Scripture, then the Truths before mentioned. It is affirmed of the man *Christ Iesus*, that he *knew what was in the heart of man*, that he *would be with his unto the end of the World*, and *Thomas* putting his hand into his side, cryed out to him, *my Lord, and my God*, &c. [w] when Christ neither did, nor was so, as he was man. Againe it is said, *that God redeemed his Church with his own bloud*, that the sonne of God *was made of a Woman*, that the *Word was made flesh*, none of which can properly be spoken of God, his *Sonne*, or *Eternall Word*, [x] in respect of that nature whereby he is so : and therefore we say, that look what Properties are peculiar to either of his natures, as to be *omniscient, omnipotent*, to be the *object of Divine worship*, to the *Diety*; [y] to be *borne*, to *bleed* and *dye*, to the Humanity, are spo-

u *Non ut Deus esset habitator, natura humana esset habitaculum: sed ut naturæ alteri sic misceretur altera, ut quamvis alia sit quæ suscipitur, alia vero quæ suscipit, in tantam tamen unitatem conveniret utriusq; diversitas, ut unus idemq; sit filius, qui se, & secundum quod unus homo est, patre dicit minorem, & secundum quod unus Deus est, patri se profitetur æqualem.* Leo. Serm. 3. de Nat.

w Τὺς μὲν ταπεινὺς λόγυς τῷ ἐκ μαρίας ἀνθρώπῳ, τὺς δὲ ἀνηγμένυς, καὶ θεοπρεπεῖς τῷ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντι λόγῳ. *Theod: Dial.* Ασυγχ. x Ταῦτα πάντα σύμβολα σαρκὸν τῆς ἀπὸ γῆς εἰλημμένης. *Iræn: Lib.* 3. *ad: Hæres.*

y *Salva proprietate utriusq; naturæ, suscepta est a Majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab æternitate modalitas.* Leo. Epist. ad Flavi.

ken

ken of, in reference to his Person, wherein both those natures are united: so that whereas the Scriptures say, that *God redeemed his Church with his own blood*, or that he was *made flesh*, or whereas in a consonancy thereunto, and to obviate the folly of *Nestorius*, who made *two persons of Christ*, the Antients called the blessed Virgin, the *Mother of God*, the intendment of the one and other, is no more, but that He was *truly God*, who in his manhood was a Sonne, had a *Mother*, did *Bleed and Dye*. And such Scripture expressions, we affirm to be founded in this *communication of Properties*, or the assignement of that unto the [z] Person of Christ, however expressely spoken of as God, or Man, which is proper to him in regard of either of these natures, the one or other. God on this account being said, to do what is proper to man, and man what is proper alone to God, because He who is both God and Man, doth both the one and the other: By what expressions, and with what diligence the Antients warded the doctrine of Christs *personall union*, against both [a] *Nestorius* and *Eutiches*, the one of them dividing his Person into two, the other confounding his Natures, by an absurd confusion, and mixture of their respective essentiall propricties, (M. B. not giving occasion) I shall not farther mention.

[z] Οὐσίᾳ ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ἀνυπάρκτως ἑκατέρας φύσεως ἀνυπερθέτως τῇ ἑκατέρᾳ τὰ ἴδια, διὰ τὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως ταυτότητα, καὶ τὴν εἰς ἀλλήλα αὐτῶν περιχώρησιν. *Damas. de Orthod. fide. lib.* 3. c. 4.

[a] Ἀληθῶς. πλέως. ἀδιαιρέτως. ἀσυγχύτως. *vide Evagrium lib:* 1. c. 2, 3. *Socrat: Hist: l:* 7. c. 29. 32, 33. *Nicph: l:* 14. *cap:* 47.

And this is all M. B. instances in, of what he rejects, as to our Doctrine about the *Nature of God*, the *Trinity*, *Person of Christ*, and the *Holy Ghost*, of all which he hath left us no more, then what the *Turkes*, and other [b] *Mahumetans*, will freely acknowledge. And whether this be to be a *meere Christian*, or *none at all*, the pious Reader will judge.

[b] *Vid: Joh: Hen: Hotting: Histor: Orientalis: lib.* 1. *c.* 3. *ex Alko. sura.* 30.

Having dealt thus with the Person of Christ, he addes the names of *two abominable figments*, to give countenance to his undertaking, wherein he knowes those with whom he hath to doe, have no communion: casting the Deity of Christ, and the Holy Ghost, into the same bundle, with *Transubstantiation*, and *Consubstantiation*, to which he addes the ubiquity of the body of Christ after mentioned, selfe contradicting fictions. With what sincerity, candor, and Christian ingenuity, M. B. hath proceeded, in rolling up together such abominations as these, with the most weighty, and glorious truths of the Gospell, that together he might

might trample them under his feet in the mire, God will certainly in due time reveale to himselfe, and all the World.

The next thing he decryes is *Originall sinne*. I will suppose Mr B. knowes, what those whom he professeth to oppose, *intend* thereby; and this he condemnes *Name* and *Thing*: [c] That the guilt of our *first Fathers sinne, is imputed to his posterity*, that they are made *obnoxious to death thereby*, that we are *by nature Children of wrath, dead in Trespasses and sins, conceived in sin*, that our *Understandings are darkneste*, so that we cannot *receive the things that are of God*, that we are able to *do no good of our selves*, so that unlesse we are *borne againe we cannot enter into the Kingdome of God*, that we are *alienated, enemies, have carnall minds, that are enmity against God*, and cannot be subject to him; all this and the like, is at once blowne away by M. B. there is no such thing; *una litura potest*. That Christ by *Nature is not God*, that we by *Nature have no sin*, are the two great principles of this meere *Christians* beliefe.

[c] Rom: 5. 12, 15, 16. 19.
Eph. 2. 1, 12. Psal. 51. 5. Ioh. 1. 5. Ephes. 4. 18. 1 Cor. 2. 14. Ioh. 3. 5, 6. Ephes. 2. 12. Col. 1. 21. Rom. 8. 6, 7, 8.

Of Christs *taking our nature upon him*, which is againe mentioned, we have spoken before. [d] *If he was made flesh, made of a Woman, made under the Law, if he partooke of flesh and blood, because the Children partook of the same, if he took on him the seed of Abraham, and was made like to us in all things, sinne only excepted; if being in the forme of God, and equall to him, he took on him the forme of a Servant, and became like to us, he took our nature on him*: for these, and these only are the things, which by that expression are intended.

[d] Iohn. 1. 14. Gal. 4. 4, 5. Heb. 2. 14, 16. Heb. 2. 18. Phil. 2. 7, 8.

The most of what followes, is about the *Grace of Christ*, which having destroyed, what in him lies, his *Person* he doth also openly reject. And in the first place begins with the foundation, his *making satisfaction to God for our sinnes, all our sinnes, past, present, and to come*; which also, under sundry other expressions, he doth afterwards condemne. [f] God is a God of *purer eyes then to behold iniquity*, and it is *his judgement, that they which commit sinne, are worthy of death*: yea it is *a righteous thing with him, to render tribulation to Offenders*: and seeing we have *all sinned, and come short of the glory of God*, doubtlesse it will be a righteous thing with him, to leave them to answer for their own sinnes, who so proudly, and contemptuously, reject the satisfaction which he himselfe hath appointed, and the [g] *ransome* he hath *found out*. But M. B. is not the first who hath *erred, not knowing the Scriptures*, nor the justice of God; The Holy Ghost acquainting us, that God [h] *made to meet*

[f] Hab: 1. 13. Rom. 1. 32. 2 Thes. 1. 6.
[g] Iob. 33. 24. [h] Isa: 53. 5, 6, 10, 11.

upon

upon him the iniquity of us all, that he was bruised for our sinnes, and wounded for our transgressions, and that the chastisement of our peace was on him, that by his stripes we are healed, that he gave his life a ransome for us, and was made sinne for us, that we might become the righteousnesse of God in him, that he was *for us made under the Law, and underwent the curse of it, that he bare our sinnes in his body on the tree,* and that by his blood we *are redeemed,* washed, *and* saved: we doubt not to speake as we believe, *viz.* That Christ underwent the punishments due to our sinnes, and made *satisfaction* to the justice of God for them: and Mr B. who it seemes is otherwise perswaded, we leave to stand or fall to his own account.

1 Pet:2.24. Matth:20.28. Tit:2.14. 2 Cor:5.21. Gal:4.4. 1 Pet:1.18. Ephes:1.7. Revel:1.5,6. &c.

Most of the following instances of the Doctrines he reiects, belong to, and may be reduced to the head last mentioned, and therefore I shall but touch upon them: seeing that he, that *will enter into life, must keep the commandements,* and this of our selves we cannot doe, for in *many things we offend all,* and he that breakes *one Commandement,* is guilty of the *breach of the whole Law*; God having sent forth *his Sonne, made of a Woman, made under the Law, to redeeme them that were under the Law, that wee might receive the adoption of Children,* and that which was impossible to us by the Law, through the weakenesse of the flesh, *God sending his own Sonne in the likenesse of sinfull flesh, and for sinne condemned sinne in the flesh, that the righteousnesse of the Law might be fulfilled in us*; and so we are *saved by his life, being justified by his blood,* he being made unto us of God *righteousnesse,* and we are by Faith *found in him, having on not our own righteousnesse, which is by the Law, but that which is by Jesus Christ, the righteousnesse of God by Faith*; we doe affirme, that Christ fulfilled the *Law* for us, not only undergoing the *penalty* of it, but for us submitting to the obedience of it, and performing all that Righteousnesse which of us it requires, that we might have a compleate Righteousnesse wherewith to appeare before God. And this is that which is intended by the *active* and *passive Righteousnesse* of Christ, after mentioned; all which is reiected *name and thing.*

i Math:19.17. 1 Ioh:1.8. Iam:2.10. Rom:8.3,4. 10.4. Gal:4.4,5. Rom:5.9. 1 Cor:1.30. Phil.3.8,9, 10.

Of Christs being punished by God, which he reiects in the next place, and to multiply his instances of our false doctrine, insists on it again under the termes, of *Christs enduring the wrath of God, and the paines of a Damned man,* the same account is to be given, as before of his satisfaction. k That God *bruised him, put him to grief,*

k Isa:53.5,10. &c. Heb.2.9.14.

laid the *chastisement of our peace on him*; that for us he underwent
Heb:10.9,10. *death*, the *curse* of the Law, which enwrapped the whole punish-
2 Cor:5.21. ment due to sinne, and that by the *will* of God, who so made
Luk: 22. 41, him to be *sin, who knew no sin*, and in the undergoing whereof, he
42.43, 44. *prayed*, and *cryed*, and *sweat blood*, and was full of *heavinesse* and *perplexity*, the Scripture is abundandantly evident; and what we assert amounts not on title beyond what is, by, and in them affirmed.

The false doctrine of the *merit of Christ*, and his *purchasing for us the Kingdom of Heaven*, is the next stone, which this *Master Build-*
1 Cor:6.20. *er* disallowes and rejects: 1 That Christ hath *bought us with a*
1 Pet.1.18. *price*, that he hath *redeemed us from our sinnes, the World*, and curse,
Gal: 1.4. to be a *peculiar people zealous of good workes*, so making us *Kings, and*
Gal:3. 13. *Priests to God for ever*, that he hath *obtained for us Eternall Redemp-*
Titus 2.14. *tion, procuring the Spirit for us, to make us meet for the inheritance of the*
Ephes. 5. 26. *Saints in Light*, God *blessing us withall spirituall blessings in heavenly*
Rev.1.5,6. *places in him, upon the account of his making his soule an offering for sin*,
Heb:9.12,13, performing that obedience to the Law, which of us is required,
14. is that, which by this expression of the *Merit of Christ*, we intend;
Eph.1.3. The fruit of it being al the accomplishment of the Promise made
Phil.1.29. to him by the Father, upon his undertaking the great worke of Saving his people from their sinnes; in the bundle of Doctrines by M. B. at once condemned, this also hath its place.

That *Christ rose from the dead by his own power*, seemes to us to be true; not only becaus he affirmed, that he *had power so to do, even to lay down his life, & to take it up again Joh.* 10.18. but also becaus he said he would do so, when he had *them destroy the temple, and told them, that in three dayes he would raise it againe*: It is true that this *worke of raising Christ from the dead*, is also ascribed to the Father, and to the Spirit, (as in the worke of his *oblation*, his Father *made his soule an offering for sinne*, & he *offered up himselfe through the Eternall Spirit*) yet this hinders not, but that he was raised by *his owne Power*, his Father and he being *one*, and what worke his Father doth, he doing the same.

And this is the Account which this *meere Christian* giveth us, concerning his *Faith* in Christ, his Person, and his Grace; He is a *meere man*, that neither *satisfied for our sinnes*, nor *procured Grace*, or *Heaven for us*; And how much this tends to the honour of Christ, and the good of soules, all that *love him in sincerity*, will judge and determine.

His

His next Attempt is upon the Way, whereby the Scripture affirmes that we come to be made Partakers of the good things which Christ hath done and wrought for us; and in the first place, falls foule upon that, of *apprehending and applying Christs Righteousnesse to our selves by Faith*; that so there may no weighty point of the *doctrine of the Crosse* remaine not condemned (by this wise man) *of folly*. This then goes also *name and thing*: Christ is of God made unto us *Righteousnes*, (that is, *to them that believe on him*, or receive or apprehend him *Joh.* 1.12.[m]) God *having set him forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his Bloud, to declare his righteousnesse for the forgivenesse of sinnes*, and declaring, that every one who *believes in him is justified from all things, from which he could not be justified by the Law, God imputing Righteousnesse* to them that so believe, those who are *so justified by Faith*, having peace with God, it being the great thing we have to ayme at, namely, that *we may know Jesus Christ and the fellowship of his sufferings, and the power of his Resurrection, and to be found not having our owne righteousnesse, which is by the Law, but the Righteousnesse which is by the faith of Christ, Christ being the end of the Law to every one that believeth*, we say it is the duty of every one, who is called, to apprehend *Christ by Faith*, and apply his Righteousnesse to him; that is, believe on him, as made *Righteousnesse of God to him*, unto justification and Peace. And if M. *Biddle* reject this Doctrine, *name and thing*; I pray God give him Repentance, before it be too late, to the acknowledgement of the Truth.

[m] Rom. 3. 25. Acts 13. 38, 39. Rom. 4. 5, 7. Rom. 5. 1. Phil. 3. 9, 10. Rom. 10. 3, 4.

Of Christ's *being our surety, of Christs paying our debt, of our sinnes imputed to Christ, of Christs righteousnesse imputed to us, of Christs dying to appease the wrath of God, and reconcile him to us*, enough hath been spoken already, to cleare the meaning of them, who use these Expressions; & to manifest the truth of that which they intend by them: so that I shall not need againe to consider them, as they lye in this disorderly confused heape, which we have here gathered together.

Our *Justification* by Christ being cashiered, he falls upon our *Sanctification* in the next place, that he may leave us as little of Christians, as he hath done our Saviour of the true *Messiah*. *Infused Grace* is first assaulted: The various acceptions of the word Grace in the Scripture, this is no place to insist upon. By *Grace infused*, we meane *Grace really* bestowed upon us, and abiding in us, from the Spirit of God. That a new [n] *Spirituall Life*,

[n] Ephes. 2. 1, 2. Gal. 5. 25, 26.

or principles, inabling men to live to God, that new gratious heavenly qualityes, & endowments, as *Light, Love, Joy, Faith &c.* bestowed on men, are called *Grace*, and *Graces* of the Spirit; I suppose will not be denyed. These we call *infused Grace*, and *Graces*: that is, we say God workes these things in us, by his Spirit, giving us a o *new heart*, and a *new Spirit, putting his Law into our hearts, quickning us who were dead in trespasses and sinnes*, making us *light*, who were *darkenesse*, filling us with the *fruits of the Spirit*, in *joy, meekenesse, Faith*, which are not of our selves, but the gifts of God. Mr *Biddle* having before disclaimed all *originall sinne*, or the depravation of our nature by sinne, in deadnesse, darkenesse, obstinacy, &c. thought it also incumbent on him, to disowne, and disallow all *reparation of it by Grace*; and all this under the name of a *meere Christian*, not knowing that he discovereth a frame of Spirit utterly unacquainted with the maine things of Christianity.

o Phil. 1.6. 2. 13. Jerem. 31.33. 32,39. Ezek. 11. 19. 36. 26. Heb. 8.9,10.

Free Grace is next doomed to rejection. That all the Grace, Mercy, Goodnesse of God, in our *Election, Redemption, Calling, Sanctification, pardon*, and *Salvation*, is free, not deserved, not merited, nor by us any way procured, that God doth all that he doth for us bountifully, fully, freely, of his own Love, & Grace, is affirmed in this expression, and intended thereby. And is this found neither *name* nor *thing* in the Scriptures? Is there no mention of Gods loving us *freely*, of his p *blotting out our sinnes for his owne sake, for his names sake*, of his *giving his Sonne for us from his own Love*, of *Faith being not of our selves, being the gift of God, of his saving us not according to the workes of Righteousnesse, which we have done, but of his own mercy, of his justifying us by his Grace, begetting us of his own will, having mercy on whom he will have mercy*, of a *Covenant* not like the old, wherein he hath promised to be *mercifull to our sinnes & our iniquities &c.*? or is it possible that a man assuming to himselfe the name of a *Christian*, should be ignorant of the doctrine of the *free Grace* of God, or oppose it, and yet professe not to reject the Gospell as a fable? But this was, and even will be the condemnation of some, *that light is come into the World, and men love darkenesse, more then light.*

p Ephes. 1.4. Joh. 3.16. 1 Joh. 4 8,10. Rom. 5.8. Ephes. 2.8. Tit. 3. 3,4,5, 6,7. Iam. 1.18. Rom. 9. 18. Heb. 8.10, 11, 12.

About the next expression, of the *world of the Elect*, I shall not contend. That by the name of the *world* (which terme is used in the Scriptures, in great variety of significations) the Elect, as being in, and of this visible world, and by nature no better then the

rest

rest of the inhabitants thereof, are sometimes peculiarly intended, is proved elsewhere, beyond whatever M. B. is able to oppose thereunto. g *Salus Electorum sanguis Iesu*, or the death of death &c.

Of the irresistible working of the Spirit, in bringing men to believe, the condition is otherwise; about the terme *irresistible*, I know none that care much to strive. That *Faith is the gift of God, not of our selves*, that it is wrought in us, by the *exceeding greatnesse of the power of God*: that in *bestowing* it upon us by his Spirit, (that is, in our conversion) God effectually *creates a new heart* in us, makes us *new creatures, quickens us, raises us from the dead*, working in us to *will, and to do*, of his own good pleasure, as he *commanded light to shine out of darkenesse, so shining into our hearts, to give us the knowledge of his glory*, begetting us anew of his own will, so *irresistibly causing* us to believe, because he effectually workes faith in us; is the summe of what M. *Biddle* here rejecteth, that he might be sure (as before) to leave nothing of weight in Christian Religion uncondemned. But these trifles and falsityes being renounced, he complaines of the abuse of his darling, that it is called *carnall reason*; which being the only interpreter of Scripture, which he allowes of, he cannot but take it amisse, that it should be so grossely slandered, as to be called *carnall*. Eph. 2.8. 18. 19. 2 Cor. 5.17. &c. 2 Cor: 4.6.

The Scripture indeed tells us of a *Naturall man*, that *cannot discerne the things which are of God*, and that they are *foolishnesse to him*: of a *carnall mind that is enmity to God*; and not like to have any *Reasons*, or *reasonings, but what are carnall: of a Wisdome that is carnall, sensuall, and divelish*: of a *wisdome* that God will *destroy* and *confound*, and that such is the best of the wisdome and Reason of all unregenerate persons: but why the Reason of a man in such a state, with such a mind, about the things of God, should be called *carnall*, M. B. can see no Reason: and some men perhaps will be apt to thinke, that it is because all his Reason is still carnall. When a man is renued *after the image of him that creats him*, he is made *spirituall, light in the Lord*, every thought and imagination that sets up it selfe in his heart, in opposition to God, being lead captive to the Obedience of the Gospell: we acknowledg a sanctified Reason in such an one, of that use in the dijudicatiō of the things of God, as shal afterwards be declared. 1 Cor: 2. 14. Rom: 8. 7. James 3. 15.

Spirituall desertions are nextly decryed. Some poore soules would thank him to make good this discovery. They find mention in

Iob. 13. 24. Psal. 13. 1. Ps. 10. 1. 27. 9. 44. 24. 80. 7. 55. 1. 69. 17. 102. 2. Isa. 45. 15. Ha. 8. 17. 49. 14. 54. 6, 7. 60. 15. Isa. 50. 10. &c.

in the Scripture of Gods *hiding his face, withdrawing himselfe, forsaking though but for a moment*, as of thē that on this account *walk in darknes and see no light*, that *seeke him*, and *find him not*, but are filled with *troubles, terrours, arrowes from him &c.* And this in some measure they find to be the condition of their own soules; they have not the *Life, Light, Power, Joy, Consolation, sence of Gods love* as formerly, and therefore they think there are *Spirituall desertions*, and that in respect of *their* soules, these dispensations of God are signally, and significantly so termed; and they feare that those who deny all desertions, never had any enjoyments from, or of God.

Of *Spirituall incomes*, there is the same Reason. It is not the *phrase of speech*, but the *thing it selfe* we contend about. That God who is the Father of *Mercy*, and *God of all Consolation*, gives *Mercy, Grace, Joy, Peace, Consolation*, as to whom, so in what manner, or in what degree he pleaseth. The receiving of *these* from God, is by some (and that perhaps not ineptly) termed *Spirituall incomes*; with regard to Gods gracious distributions of his kindnesse, love, goodwill, and the reciving of them. So that it be acknowledged, that we do receive Grace, Mercy, Joy, Consolation, and Peace from God, variously as he pleaseth, we shall not much labour about the significancy of that, or any other expression of the like kind. The Scriptures, mentioning the *goings forth of God*, leave no just cause to M. B. of condemning them, who sometimes call any of his workes, or dispensations, his *outgoings*. His rehearsall of all these particular instances, in doctrines that are found neither *Name* nor *Thing* in Scriptures, M. B. closeth with an *&c.* which might be interpreted to comprize *as many more*, but that there remaine not, *as many more* important heads in Christian Religion. The *Nature* of God being abased, the *Deity* & *Grace* of Christ denyed, the sin of our *Natures*, and their renovation by Grace in Christ rejected: M. B's remaining Religion, will be found scarce worth the inquiry after, by those whom he undertakes to instruct: there being scarcely any thing left by him, from whence we are peculiarly denominated Christians: nor any thing that should support the weight of a sinfull soule, which approacheth to God for life and Salvation.

Micah. 5. 2.

To prevent the entertainment of such Doctrines as these,

M.

M.B. commends the advice of *Paul* 2 *Tim.* 1.13. *hold fast the forme of sound words &c.* then which we know none more wholesome, nor more usefull, for the safeguarding, and defence of those Holy and Heavenly principles of our Religion, which M. B. rejects and tramples on: nor are we at all concerned in his following discourse, of leaving *Scripture termes, and using Phrases, and expressions coyned by men*; for if we use any word or phrase in the things of God, and his worship, and cannot make good the thing signified thereby, to be founded on, and found in the Scriptures, we will instantly renounce it. But if indeed the words and expressions, used by any of the Ancients, for the explication and confirmation of the Faith of the Gospell, especially of the Doctrine concerning the *Person of Christ*, in the vindication of it from the Hereticks, which in sundry ages bestir'd themselves (as M. B. now doth) in opposition thereunto, be found consonant to Scriptures, and to signify nothing but what is written therein with the beames of the Sun, perhaps we see more cause to retaine them, from the opposition here made to them by M. B. then formerly we did: considering, that his opposition to *words* and *phrases*, is not for their own sake, but of the *things* intended by them.

The similitude of the ship, *that lost its first matter and substance, by the addition of new pieces, in way of supplement to the old decayes*, having been used by some of our *Divines*, to illustrate the *Roman Apostacy*, and *Traditionall-Additionalls* to the Doctrines of the Gospell, will not stand Mr B. in the least stead; unlesse he be able to prove, that we have lost in the Religion we professe, any one materiall part of what it was, when given over to the Churches by Christ and his Apostles, or have added any one particular, to what they have provided, and furnished us withall in the Scriptures: which untill he hath done, by these and the like insinuations, he doth but beg the thing in question; which being a matter of so great consequence, and importance as it is, will scarce be granted him on any such termes. I doubt not, but it will appeare to every person whatsoever, in the processe of this businesse, who hath his *senses any thing exercised in the Word, to discerne between good and evill*, and whose eyes the *God of this World hath not blinded*, that the *glorious light of the Gospell of God*, should not shine into their hearts, that Mr B. as wise as he deemes it,

and

& reports himselfe to be, is indeed like the *foolish Woman*, that plus downe her house with *both her hands*, labouring to destroy the house of God with all his strength, pretending that this, and that part of it, doth not originally belong thereto, (or like [s] *Ajax* in his madnesse, who killed *Sheep*, and supposed they had been his Enemies) upon the account of that enmity, which he finds in his own mind unto them.

s *Sophoc. in Ajace.* μαστιγοφ.

The close of M. B's Preface, containes an *Exhortation to the study of the Word*, with an account of the *successe he himselfe hath obtained, in the search thereof, both in the detection of Errors, and the discovery of sundry Truths*: Some things I shall remarke upon that discourse, and shut up these considerations of his Preface.

1. For his own successe he tells us, *that being otherwise of no great abilityes, yet searching the Scriptures impartially he hath detected many errours, & hath presented the Reader with a body of Religion from the Scriptures, which whoso shall well ruminate and digest, will be enabled &c.*

For M. B's Abilityes, I have not any thing to do, to call them into question; whether *small* or *great*, he will one day find, that he hath scarce used them to the end for which he is intrusted with them; And when the Lord of his *Talents*, shall call for an account, it will scarce be comfortable to him, that he hath ingaged them so much to his dishonour, as it will undoubtedly appeare he hath done. I have heard by those of M. B's time, and acquaintance in the *University*, that what abilitye he had then obtained, were it *more* or *lesse*, he still delighted to be excercising of it, in opposition to received truths in Philosophy; and whither an itching desire of novelty, and emerging thereby, lye not at the bottome of the course he hath since steared, he may do well to examine himselfe.

t *Euseb. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 21. Iran. ad Hær. lib. 1. cap. 26. Epiphan: Hær. 1. Tom: 2. lib. 1. Ruff: cap. 27.*

What errours he hath detected (though but pretended such) (which honour in the next place he assumes to himselfe,) I know not. The *errour of the Deity of Christ* was detected in the Apostles dayes, by [t] *Elion, Cerinthus* and others: not long after by [u] *Paulus Samosatenus*, by *Photinus*, by *Arius*, and others; The errour of the *purity, simplicity*, and *spirituality* of the *Essence* of God, by *Audæus*, and the *Anthropomorphites*. The errour of the Deity of the Holy Ghost, was long since detected by *Macedonius*, and

u *Euseb. lib. 7. c. 22, 23, 24. August: Hæres. 44. Epiphan: Heres. 1. lib. 2. Socrab. Hist. l. 2. cap. 24. &c.*

hi

his companions; the Errour of *originall* sinne, or the coruption of our nature, by *Pelagius*: the Errour of the *satisfaction* and merit of Christ, by *Abailardus*; All of them by *Socinus*, *Smalcius*, *Crellius*, &c. What new discoveries M. B. hath made, I know not; nor is there any thing that he presents us with, in his whole body of Religion, as stated in his questions, but what he hath found prepared digested, & modelled to his hand, by his masters the *Socinians*; unlesse itbe some few grosse notions about the Deity: nor is so much as the Language, which here he useth of himselfe, and his discoveryes his own, but borrowed of *Socinus* Epist. ad Squarcialupum.

We have not then the least reason in the world, to suppose that M. B was lead into these glorious discoveryes, by *reading of the Scriptures*, much lesse *impartial* reading of them; but that they are all the fruits of a deluded heart, given up righteously of God to *believe a lye*, for the neglect of his word, & contempt of reliance upon his Spirit, & Grace, for a right understanding thereof, *by the cunning slights of the formentioned* persons, in some of whose writings, Sathan lyes in *waite to deceive*. And for the body of Religion which he hath collected, which lyes not in the Answers which are set down in the words of the Scripture, but in the *Interpretations*, and *conclusions*, couched in his *Questions*, I may safely say, it is one of the most corrupt, and abominable, that ever issued from the endeavours of one, who called himselfe a *Christian*; for a proofe of which assertion, I referre the Reader to the ensuing considerations of it. So that whatever promises of successe M. B. is pleased to make unto him, who shall *ruminate, and digest in his mind, this body of his composure*, (it being indeed like poyson, that will never be digested, but fill and swell the heart with pride, and venome, untill it utterly destroy the whole person) it may justly be feared, that he hath given too great an advantage to a sort of men in the world, not behind M. B. for abilityes and Reason, (the only guide allowed by him in affaires of his nature) to decry the use and Reading of the Scripture, which they see *unstable*, & *unlearned* men fearefully to wrest to their own destructions. But let God be true, and all men lyers. Let the Gospell runne and prosper; and if it be hid to any, it is to them, whom the God of this world hath blinded, that the glorious light thereof, should not shine into their

hearts. What may farther be drawn forth of the same kind with what is in these *Catechismes* delivered, with an imposition of it upon the Scripture, as though any occasion were thence administred thereunto, I know not: but yet doe suppose, that Sathan himselfe is scarce able to furnish the thoughts of men, with many more Abominations of the like length, and breadth, with those here endeavoured to be imposed on simple, unstable soules, unlesse he should ingage them into down right Atheisme, and professed contempt of God. Of what tendency these Doctrines of M. B. are unto *Godlinesse*, which he nextly mentioneth, will in its proper place fall under consideration. It is true, the Gospell is a *doctrine according to Godlinesse*, and aymes at the *promotion of it in the hearts*, and lives of men, in order to the exaltation of the Glory of God. And hence it is, that so soone as any poore deluded soule, falls into the snare of Sathan, and is taken captive under the power of any Errour whatever, the first sleight he puts in practice for the promotion of it, is to declaime about its Excellency and usefullnesse for the furtherance of godlinesse; though himselfe in the meane time, be under the power of darkenesse, and know not in the least what belongs to the Godlinesse, which he professeth to promote. As to what M. B. here drawes forth to that purpose, I shall be bold to tell him, that to the accomplishment of a Godlinesse amongst men, (since the fall of *Adam*) that hath not its rise and foundation in the effectuall powerfull changing of the whole man, from *death* to *Life*, *darkenesse* to *Light*, *&c.* in the washing of the pollutions of nature by the bloud of Christ, that is not wrought in us, and carryed on by the efficacy of the Spirit of Grace, taking away the heart of stone, and giving a new heart, circumcised to feare the Lord, that is not purchased and procured for us by the *Oblation*, and *Intercession* of the Lord Jesus, a Godlinesse that is not promoted by the consideration of the vitiousnesse, and corruption of our hearts by nature, and their Alienation from God, and that doth not in a good part of it consist in the mortifying, killing, slaying of the sinne of nature, that dwelleth in us, and an opposition to all the actings and workings of it, A Godlinesse that is performed by our own strength, in yeilding obedience to the precepts of the Word, that by that obedience

we

we may be justified before God, and for it accepted, &c. there is not one tittle, *letter*, nor *iota* in the whole Book of God tending. M. B. closeth his Preface with a commendation of the *Scriptures*, their *excellency*, *and divinity*, with the eminent successe that they shall find who yeild obedience to them, in that they shall be *even in this life equall unto Angells*. His expressions at first view seeme to separate him from his Companions in his Body of Divinity, which he pretends to collect from the Scriptures, whose low thoughts, bold expressions, concerning the contradictions in them, shall afterwards be pointed unto. But I feare

——— *latet anguis in herbâ:*

And in this kisse of the Scripture with *haile* unto it, there is vile treachery intended, and the betraying of them to the hands of men, to be dealt withall at their pleasure. I desire not to entertaine evill surmises of any (what just occasion soever be given on any other account) concerning things that have not their evidence and conviction in themselves. The bleating of that expression, *The Scriptures are the exactest rule of an holy life*, evidently allowing other rules of an holy life, though they be the *exactest*, and admitting other things, or Bookes, into a compartnership with them, in that their use and service, though the *preheminence* be given to them, sounds as much to their dishonour, as any thing spoken of them by any, who ever owned them to have proceeded from God. It is the Glory of the Scriptures, not only to be the *Rule*, but the *only one* of walking with God. If you take any other into *comparison* with it, and allow them in the triall to be Rules indeed, though not so *exact* as the Scripture, you do no lesse cast downe the Scripture from its Excellency, then if you denied it to be any Rule at all. It will not lye as *one* of the many, though you say never so often that it is the *best*. What issues there will be of the endeavour, to give Reason the absolute soveraignty in judging of Rules of holinesse, allowing others, but preferring the Scriptures, and therein without other assistance, determining of all the contents of it, in order to its utmost end, God in due time will manifest. We confesse (to close with M.B.) that *true obedience to the Scriptures, makes men even in this life, equall in some sence unto Angells*: not upon the account of their performance of that obedience meerely, as though there

could be an equality between the obedience, yeilded by us, whileſt we are yet ſinners, and continue ſo, (*for if we ſay we have no ſinne we deceive our ſelves*) and the exact obedience of them who never ſinned, but abide in doing the will of God, but the principall, and maine worke of God required in them, and which is the root of all other obedience whatever, being to *believe on him whom he hath ſent*, to as many *as ſo believe on him, and ſo receive him, power is given to become the ſonnes of God*; who being ſo adopted into the great family of Heaven and Earth, which is called after Gods name, and inveſted with all the priviledges thereof; having *fellowſhip with the Father and the Sonne*, they are in that regard, even in this life, *equall to Angells*. Having thus briefly as I could, waſhed off the paint, that was put upon the Porch of M. B's *Fabrick*, and diſcovered it to be a compoſure of *rotten poſts*, and *dead mens bones*, whoſe Pargeting being removed, their abomination lies naked to all, I ſhall enter the building, or heap it ſelfe, to conſider what entertainment he hath provided therein, for thoſe, whom in the entrance he doth ſo *ſubtilly* and earneſtly invite to turne in, and partake of his proviſions.

CAP.

CAP. I.

M. B's first Chapter Examined. *Of the Scriptures.*

MR *Biddle* having imposed upon himselfe the task of insinuating his Abominations, by applying the *expresse words of Scripture*, in way of Answer to his captious and Sophisticall *Queries*, was much straitned in the very entrance, in that he could not find any Text, or tittle in them, that is capable of being wrested to give the least colour to those *imperfections*, which the residue of men, with whom he is in the whole *Systeme* of his doctrine in complyance and communion, do charge them withall. As that there are *contradictions*, in them, though in things of *lesse importance*: that many things *are*, or *may be changed*, and *altered in them*; *that some of the bookes of the Old Testament are lost*, & that those *that remaine*, *are not of any necessity to Christians*, although they *may be read with profit*; Their subjecting them also, and all their Assertions, to the *last judgment of Reason*, is of the same nature with the other. But it being not my purpose, to pursue his opinions, through all the secret windings and turnings of them, so to drive them to their proper issue, but only to discover the sophistry and falsenesse of those insinuations, which grosely and palpably overthrow the foundations of Christianity. I shall not force him to speake to any thing, beyond what he hath expresly delivered himselfe unto. §. 1.

a *Socin: de Authorit. Sa. Scrip. cap. 1. Racov: An. 1611 p. 13. Socin: Lect. Sacr. p: 18. Episcop: disput: de Author: Script: thes: 3. Volkels de vera Relig: lib. 5. cap: 5. p: 375. Socinus autem videtur rectius de SS: opinari, Epist: ad Radec: 3 p: 140. Ego quidem sentio, nihil in Scriptis, quæ communiter ab iis, qui Christiani sunt dicti, recepta, & pro divinis habita sunt, constanter legi, quod non sit verissimum: hocce ad divinam Providentiam pertinere prorsus arbitror, ut ejusmodi scripta, nunquam depraventur aut corrumpantur, neq; ex toto, neq; ex parte.*

§. 2. This first Chapter then, concerning the Scriptures, both in the *greater* and *lesser Catechismes*, without farther trouble, I shall passe over; seeing that the stating of the Questions, and Answers in them, may be sound, and according to the *Common Faith* of the Saints, in those who partake not with M. B's companions, in their low thoughts of them, which here he doth professe. Only I dare not joyne with him, in his last assertion, *that such and such passages, are the most affectionate in the Booke of God*; seeing we know but in part, and are not enabled, nor warranted, to make such peremptory determinatons concerning the severall passages of Scripture, set in comparison, and competition for *Affectionatenesse*, by our selves.

CAP. II.

Of the Nature of God.

§. 1. HIS *second* Chapter which is concerning *God*, his *Essence*, *Nature*, and *Propertyes*, is *second* to none in his whole Booke, for Blasphemyes and Reproaches of God and his Word.

§. 2. The description of God, which he labours to insinuate, is, that he is *one Person, of a visible shape*, and *similitude, finite, limited to a certaine place, mutable, comprehensible, and obnoxious to turbulent passions, not knowing the things that are future*, and which shall be done by the *sonnes* of men, whom none can love withall his *heart*, if he believe him to be *one in three distinct Persons*.

§. 3. That this is punctually the Apprehension, and notion concerning God, and his Being, which He labours to beget, by his suiting Scripture expressions to the blasphemous *insinuations* of his Questions, will appeare in the consideration of both *Questions* and *Answers*, as they lye in the second *Chapter* of the *greater Catechisme*.

§. 4. His first Question is, *How many Gods of Christians are there?* And his Answer is; *One God, Eph. 4. 6.* Whereunto he subjoynes, secondly, *who is this one God?* And Answers, *The Father of whom are all things, 1 Cor. 8. 6.*

§. 5. That the Intendment of the connexion of these Queryes, and the

the ſuiting of words of Scripture to them, is to inſinuate ſome thoughts againſt the doctrine of the *Trinity*, is not queſtionable; eſpecially being the worke of him, that makes it his buſineſſe to oppoſe it, and laugh it to ſcorne. With what ſucceſſe this attempt is mannaged, a little conſideration of what is offered will evince. It is true, *Paul* ſayes to *us*, *there is one God*: treating of the vanity and nothingneſſe of the Idols of the Heathen, whom God hath threatned to *deprive* of all worſhip, and to ſtarve out of the world. The Queſtion as here propoſed, *how many Gods of Chriſtians are there*, having no ſuch occaſion adminiſtred unto it, as that expreſſion of *Paul*, being no parcell of ſuch a diſcourſe, as he inſiſts upon, ſounds pleaſantly towards the allowance of *many Gods*, though Chriſtians have but one. Neither is M. B. ſo averſe to *Polutheiſme*, as not to give occaſion (on other accounts) to this ſuppoſal. Jeſus Chriſt he allowes to be a God. All his companions, in the undertaking againſt his truly eternall divine Nature, ſtill affirme him to be [b] *Homo Deificatus*, and *Deus Factus*, and plead *pro verâ deitate Jeſu Chriſti*, denying yet with him, that by *Nature* He is God, of the ſame *Eſſence* with the Father: So indeed groſſely and palpably falling into, and cloſing with that Abomination, which they pretend above all men to avoid, in their oppoſition to the thrice Holy and Bleſſed Trinity. Of thoſe monſtrous figments in Chriſtian Religion which on this occaſion they have introduced, of making a *man to be an Eternall God*, of *worſhiping a meere Creature*, with *the worſhip due only to the Infinitely bleſſed God*, we ſhall ſpeak afterwards.

[b] *Smalcius de divinit. Jeſ. Chriſt. edit. Racov. An. 1608. per Jacob. Sieniewſkia. Volkel. de vera Relig. lib. 5. cap. 10. pag. 425. p. 468. & antea. p. 206. Catech. Rac. cap. 1. de cognit. Chriſt. quæſt 3. Confeſſion de foi, des Chreſtiens, qui croyent en un ſeul Dieu le Pere &c. p 18, 19. Ionas Schlichtingius, ad Meiſner: Artic: de Filio Dei pag: 387. Socin: Reſp: ad Wiekum p: 8. & paſſim reliqui.*

2. We confeſſe that to us, *there is one God, but one God*, and let all other be accurſed. *The Gods that have not made Heaven, and the Earth*, let them be [c] *deſtroyed*, according to the word of the Lord, from under theſe heavens. Yet we ſay moreover, that *there are* [d] *Three that beare witneſſe in Heaven, the Father, Word, and Spirit, and that theſe Three are one.* And in that very place, whence Mr B. cuts off his firſt Anſwer, as it is aſſerted, that there is *one God*, ſo *one Lord*, and *one Spirit*, the fountaine of all ſpirituall diſtributions §. 6.

[c] Ierem. 10. 11.

[d] 1 Ioh. 5. 7.

ſtributions are mentioned, which whether they are not alſo that one God, we ſhall have farther occaſion to conſider.

§ 7. To the next Query, concerning this *one God*, who he is, the words are, *the Father from whom are all things*; in themſelves moſt true. The Father is the one God, whom we worſhip in ſpirit, and in truth; and yet the Sonne alſo is our *Lord, and our God, Ioh.* 20. 28. Even God over all bleſſed for ever: *Rom:* 9. 5. The ſpirit alſo is the God *which workes all in all*, 1 *Cor:* 12. 6, 11. And in the name of that one God, who is Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghoſt, [c] *are we Baptized*, whom we ſerve, who to us, is the one God over all. Neither is that Aſſertion, of the Fathers being the one, and only true God, any more prejudiciall to the Sonnes being ſo alſo, then that Teſtimony given to the everlaſting Deity of the Son, is to that of the Father, notwithſtanding that to us there is but one God. The intendment of our Author in theſe Queſtions, is to Anſwer what he found in the great exemplar of his Catechiſme, the *Racovian*: [d] two of whoſe queſtions are comprehenſive of all that is here delivered, and intended by M. *Biddle*. But of theſe things more afterwards.

c Matth. 28. 18.

d *Expoſuiſti quæ cognitu ad ſalutem de eſſentia Dei ſunt prorſus neceſſaria, expone quæ ad eam rem vehementer utilia eſſe cenſeas. R. Id quidem eſt ut cognoſcamus, in eſſentia Dei unam tantum perſonam eſſe. Demonſtra hoc ipſum. R: Hoc ſane vel hinc patere poteſt, quod eſſentia Dei ſit una numero; quapropter plures numero perſonæ, in eâ eſſe nullo pacto poſſunt. Quænam eſt hæc una perſona divina? R. Eſt ille Deus unus, domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti pater.* 1 Cor. 8. 6. Catech. Racov. cap. 1. de cognit. Dei. de Dei eſſentia.

§. 8. His next inquiry is after the nature of this one God: which he Anſwers, with that of our Saviour, in *Ioh:* 4. 24. *God is a ſpirit*; in this he is ſomewhat more modeſt, though not ſo wary as his great Maſter, *Fauſtus Socinus*, & his diſciple (as to his notions about the Nature of God) *Vorſtius*. His acknowledgement of God to be a Spirit, frees him from ſharing in impudence, in this particular, with his Maſter, who will not allow any ſuch thing to be aſſerted, in theſe words of our Saviour. His words are, *Fragment. Diſput. de Adorat. Chriſti cum Chriſtiano Francken: p. 60. Non eſt fortaſſe eorum verborum ea ſententia, quam pleriq; omnes arbitrantur: Deum ſcilicet eſſe Spiritum, neq; enim ſubaudiendum eſſe dicit aliquis verbum ἐστὶ, quaſi vox πνεῦμα, recto caſu accipienda ſit. ſed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ repetendum verbum ζητεῖ, quod paulo ante præceſſit, & πνεῦμα quarto caſu accipiendum, ita ut ſententia ſit, Deum quærere & poſtulare ſpiritum. Vorſtius*

ſtius alſo followes him, *Not. ad Diſput.* 3 *p.* 200. becauſe the verbe ſubſtantive [*is*] is not in the originall expreſſed, (then the omiſſion whereof, nothing being more frequent, though I have heard of one, who from the like omiſſion 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. thought to have proved Chriſt to be the *new Creature* there intended) contrary to the Context, and coherence of the Words, deſigne of the Argument in hand, inſiſted on by our Saviour, (as he was a bold man) and emphaticallneſſe of ſignificancy in the expreſſion as it lies, he will needs thruſt in the word *ſeeketh*, and render the intention of Chriſt to be, that God *ſeekes a ſpirit*, that is, the *ſpirits of men* to worſhip him. Herein I ſay is M. B. more modeſt then his Maſter, (as it ſeemes following e *Crellius*, who in the expoſition of that place of Scripture is of another mind) though in craft, and foreſight, he be outgone by him, for if God *be a Spirit* indeed, one of a pure *ſpirituall Eſſence*, and Subſtance, the Image, ſhape, and ſimilitude, which he afterwards aſcribes to him, his corporall poſtures, which he aſſerts (Qu. 4.) will ſcarcely be found ſuitable unto him. It is incumbent on ſome kind of men, to be very wary in what they ſay: and mindfull of what they have ſaid; falſhood hath no conſiſtency in it ſelfe, no more then with the Truth. *Smalcius* in the *Racovian* Catechiſme is utterly ſilent as to this Queſtions & Anſwer. But the conſideration of this alſo, will in its due place ſucceed.

e *Significat enim Chriſtus id, quod rata ipſa dictat, Deum, cum ſpiritus ſit, non niſi ſpiritualibus revera delectari.* Crell. de Deo: ſeu de vera Rel: lib. 1 c. 15. pag. 108.

Spiritus eſt Deus: animadverterunt ibi omnes propè S. literarum interpretes, Dei nomen, quod articulo caret, in Græco notatum, ſubjecti locum tenere: vocem vero ſpiritus, quæ articulo caret, prædicati: & ſpiritus enim ſignificare ſubſtantiam: ita perinde eſt, ac ſi dictum fuiſſet, Deus eſt ſpiritus, ſeu ſpiritualis ſubſtantia. idem ibid. p. 107.

To his 4th Query, about a farther deſcription of God, by ſome of his *Attributes*, I ſhall not need to ſubjoyne any thing in way of Animadvertion; for however the Texts he cites, come ſhort of delivering that of God, which the import of the *queſtion*, to which they are annexed, doth require, yet being not wreſted to give countenance to any perverſe apprehenſion of his Nature, I ſhall not need to inſiſt upon the conſideration of them. §. 9.

Qu. 5. He falls cloſely to his worke: in theſe words, *Is not God, according to the current of the Scriptures, in a certaine place, namely in* §. 10.

Heaven? Whereunto he Answers by *many places of Scripture, that make mention of God in Heaven.*

That we may not mistake his mind, & intention in this Query, some light may be taken from some other passages in his booke. In the preface he tells you: *that God hath a similitude and shape,* (of which afterwards) & hath his *place* in the Heavens. That *God is in no certain place*, he reckons amongst those errors he oppose sin the same Preface. Of the same kind he asserteth the belieſe to be, of *Gods being infinite, & incomprehensible*: & *Cat. lesſ. p. 6. That God glistereth with Glory, & is resident in a certaine place of the Heavens, so that one may distinguish between his right and left hand by bodily sight.* This is the Doctrine of the man, with whom we have to do, concerning the Presence of God. *He is* (saith he) *in Heaven, as in a certaine place;* That which is in a certaine place, is *finite*, and limited; as from the nature of a place, and the manner of any things being in a place, shall be instantly evinced. God then is finite, and limited, be it so: (that he is infinite and incomprehensible is yet Scripture Expression) yea he is so limited, as not to be extended to the the whole compasse, and limit of the Heavens; but he is in a *certaine place of the Heavens*, yea so circumscribed, as that a man may see from his *right hand to his left*: wherein M. B. comes short of *Mahomet*, who affirmes, that when he was taken into Heaven, to the sight of God, he found *three dayes journey between his eye-browes*, which if so, it will be somewhat hard, for any one to see from his right hand to his left, being supposed at an answerable distance to that of his eye-browes. Let us see then on what Testimony, by what Authority, M B. doth here limit the Almighty, and confine him to a certaine place, shutting up his Essence and being, in some certaine part of ~~the~~ the Heavens, cutting him thereby short, as we shall see in the issue, in all those eternall perfections, whereby hitherto he hath been knowne to the sonnes of men.

§. 11. The proofe of that lyes in the places of Scripture, which making mention of God, say, *He is in Heaven, and that He looketh downe from Heaven, &c.* Of which out of some *Concordance*, some 20, or 30. are by him repeated. Not to make long worke of a short businesse; The Scriptures say, God is *in Heaven*, who ever denyed it? But do the Scriptures say he is no where else? Do the Scriptures say he is confined to Heaven, so that he is so there, as not to be in all other

other places? If M. B. thinks this any argument, *God is in Heaven*, therefore *his Essence is not Infinite*, and *immense*, therefore He is not every where, we are not of his mind. He tells you in his *Reason*, *that He assists nothing himself*: I presume his Reason was, least any should call upon him for a proofe of his Assertions. What he intends to insinuate, & what conceptions of God he labours to insinuate the *minds of unlearned*, & *unstable souls* withall, in this question under consideration, hath been from the evidence of his intendment therein, and the concurrent Testimony of other expressions of his to the same purpose, demonstrated. To propose any thing directly, in way of proofe of the truth of that which he labours insensibly to draw the minds of men unto, he was (doubtless) conscious to himselfe of so much disability for its performance, as to waive that kind of procedure. And therefore his whole endeavour is, having filled, animated, and spirited, the understandings of men with the notion concluded in his Question, to cast in some Scripture expressions, that as they lye, may seem fitted, to the fixing of the notion before begotten in them. As to any attempt of direct proofe of what he would have continued, the *man of Russia* is utterly silent.

2. None of those Texts of Scripture, where mention is made of Gods being in Heaven, are in the coherence, and dependance of speech, wherein they lye, suited, or intended at all, to give answer to this Question, or any like it, concerning the *Presence of God*, or his actuall existence in any place, but only in respect of some dispensations of God, and workes of his, whose fountaine and originall he would have us to consider in himselfe, and to come forth from him there, where in an eminent manner he manifests his Glory. God is I say in none of the places by him as god, said to be *in Heaven*, in respect of his Essence or being, nor is it the intention of the Holy Ghost, in any of them, to declare the manner of Gods Essentiall presence, and existence, in reference to all, or any places: but only by the way of eminency, in respect of manifestations of himselfe, and operations from his glorious presence, doth he so speak of him. And indeed in those expressions, *Heaven*, doth not so much signify a place, as a thing, or at least a place, in reference to the things there done, or the peculiar manifestations of the Glory

of God there; so that if these places should be made use of, as to the proofe of the figment insinuated, the Argument from them would be, *à non causâ pro causâ*. The reason why God is said to be *in Heaven*, is not because his Essence is included in a certaine place, so called, but because of the more eminent manifestation of his Glory there, and the regard which he requires to be had of him, manifesting his Glory, as the first cause, and Author of all the workes, which outwardly are of him.

§. 13. 3. God is said to be in Heaven in an especiall manner, because he hath assigned that as the place of the Saints expectation of that enjoyment of eternall fruition of himselfe, which he hath promised to blesse them withall. But for the limiting of his essence to a certaine place in Heaven, the Scriptures, as we shall see, know nothing, yea expresly, and positively affirme the contrary.

§. 14. Let all then supply our catechumens, in the Rome of M. B's, with this Question, expresly leading to the things enquired after.

What sayes the Scripture concerning the Essence and presence of God, is it confined and limited to a certaine place, or is he infinitely, and equally present every where?

Ans. *The Lord your God, he is God in Heaven above, and in earth beneath Josh.* 2. 11.

But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold the Heavens, and Heaven of Heavens cannot containe thee, how much lesse the House that I have builded. 1 *Kings* 8. 27.

Whither shall I goe from thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascended up into Heaven thou art there, if I make my bed in Hell, behold thou art there, &c. Psal. 139. 7, 8, 9, 10. *The Heaven is my Throne, and the Earth my footstoole. Isaiah* 66. 1. *Acts* 7. 47, 48.

Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afarre off, can any hide himselfe in secret places, that I shall not see him, saith the Lord, do not I fill Heaven and Earth saith the Lord? Jerem. 23. 24.

§. 15. It is of the *ubiquity and omnipresence* of God, that these places expresly treat; and whereas it was manifested before, that the expression of Gods being in Heaven, doth not at all speak to the abomination, which M. B. would insinuate thereby, the naked rehearsall of those Testimonies, so directly asserting, and ascribing

bing to the Almighty, an Infinite, Unlimited Presence, and that in direct oppolition, to the grosse apprehension of his being confined to a certain place in Heaven, is abundantly sufficient, to deliver the thoughts, and minds of men, from any entanglements that M. B's Questions and Answers (for though it be the word of the Scripture he insists upon, yet, *malè dum recitas, incipit esse tuum*) might lead them into. On that account no more need be added: but yet this occasion being administred, that Truth it selfe, concerning the *Omnipresence*, or *Vbiquity* of God, may be farther cleared, and confirmed.

§. 16. Through the prejudices and ignorances of men, it is enquired, whether God be so present in any certain place, as not to be also equally elsewhere, every where.

Place has been commonly defined to be, *superficies corporis ambientis*; Because of sundry inextricable difficulties, and impossibility of suiting it to every place, this definition is now generally decryed. That now commonly received, is more naturall, suited to the Natures of things, and obvious to the understanding. A place, is, *spatium corporis susceptivum*; any space wherein a body may be received, and contained. The first consideration of it, is, as to its *fitnesse* and *aptnesse*, so to receive any body: so it is in the imagination only. The second, as to its *actuall existence*, being filled with that body, which it is apt to receive. So may we imagine innumerable spaces in Heaven, which are apt, and able to receive the bodies of the Saints; and which actually shall be *filled* with them, when they shall be translated thereinto, by the power of God.

§. 17. *Presence in a place*, is the actuall existence of a person in its place: or as Logicians speak, in its *Vbi*; that is, answering the enquiry after him, where he is. Though all bodies are in certain places, yet Persons only, are said to be present in them; other things have not properly a presence to be ascribed to them: They are *in* their proper places, but we doe not say, they are *present in*, or *to* their places. This being the generall description of a place, and the presence of any therein, it is evident, that properly it cannot be spoken at all of God, that he is in one place or other; for he is not a body, that should fill up the space of its receipt; nor yet in all places, taking the word properly, for so one Essence can be but in one place; and if the word should

properly be ascribed to God in any sence, it would deprive him of all his infinite Perfections.

§. 19. It is farther said, that there be three wayes of the Presence of any, in reference to a place, or places; some are so in a place, as to be *circumscribed* therein, in respect of their parts, and dimensions, such is their length, breadth, and depth, so doth one part of them fit one part of the place wherein they are, and the whole the whole, so are all solid bodies in a place; so is a man, his whole body in his whole place, his head in one part of it, his armes in another: some are so conceived to be in a place, as that in relation to it, it may be said of them, that they are there in it, so as not to be any where else, though they have not parts, and dimensions filling the place wherein they are, nor are punctually *circumscribed* with a locall space; such is the presence of *Angells*, and *Spirits*, to the places wherein they are, being not *infinite* or *immense*; These are so in some certain place, as not to be at the same time, wherein they are so, without it, or elsewhere, or in any other place: And this is proper to all finite, immateriall substances, that are so in a place, as not to occupy and fill up that space wherein they are. In respect of *place*, God is *immense*, and *indistant* to all things, and places, absent from nothing, no place, contained in none; present to all, by and in his infinite Essence, and Being, exerting his power variously, in any, or all places, as he pleaseth, revealing and manifesting his Glory, more or lesse, as it seemeth good to him.

§. 20. Of this Omnipresence of God, two things are usually enquired after. 1. The thing it selfe, or the Demonstration, that he is so *Omnipresent*. 2. The manner of it, or the Manifestation, and declaring *how* he is so present. Of this latter perhaps sundry things have been over curiously, and nicely, by some disputed: though upon a through search, their disputes may not appeare altogether useless. The Schoolemens distinctions of Gods being in a place, *repletivè, immensivè, impletivè, superexcedentèr, conservative, attinctivè; manifestative, &c.* Have, some of them at least, foundation in the Scriptures, and right Reason. That which seemes most obnoxious to exception, is their assertion, of God to be every where present, *instar puncti*: but the sence of that, and its intendment, is to expresse, how God is *not* in a place, rather then how he is. He is not in a place as *quantative* bodyes, that have

the *dimensions* attending them: Neither could his presence in Heaven, by those who shut Him up there, be any otherwise conceived, untill they were relieved by the rare notions of M. B. concerning the distinct places of *His right hand and left.* But it is not at all about the manner of Gods presence, that I am occasioned to speake, but only of the thing it selfe. They who say, He is in Heaven only, speake as to the thing, and not as to the manner of it; When we say, *He is every where*, our Assertion is also to be interpreted, as to *that* only; The *manner* of His Presence being purely of a Philosophicall consideration; His *Presence* it selfe divinely revealed, and necessarily attending his Divine perfections; Yea it is an Essentiall property of God. The propertyes of God, are either *absolute, or relative.* The absolute propertyes of God are such, as may be considered, without the supposition of any thing else whatever, towards which their *energy*, and efficacy should be exerted. His relative are such, as in their *egresse* and *exercise*, respect some things in the Creatures, though they naturally and eternally reside in God. Of the first sort is Gods *Immensity*; it is an absolute property of his nature and Being; for God to be *immense, infinite, unbounded, unlimited*, is as necessary to him, as to be God; that is, it is of his Essentiall perfection, so to be. The *Ubiquity* of God, or his presence to all things, and persons, is a relative property of God; for to say, that God is present in, and to all things, supposes those things to be. Indeed the Ubiquity of God, is the *Habitude* of his Immensity to the Creation; supposing the Creatures, the world that is, God is by reason of his Immensity, *indistant* to them all: or if more worlds be supposed, (as all things possible to the power of God, without any absurdity may be supposed) on the same account as he is Omnipresent, in reference to the present world, he would be so to them & all that is in them.

Of that which we affirme in this matter, this is the summe; §. 21.
God, who in his own being and Essence is Infinite and Immense, is by reason thereof, present in, and to the whole Creation, equally, not by a diffusion of his substance, or mixture with other things, Heaven or Earth, in, or upon them, but by an *inconceivable indistancy* of Essence to all things, though he exert his power, and manifest his Glory, in one place more then another: as in *Heaven*, in *Sion*, at the *Arke*, &c.

§. 22. 1. That this is the Doctrine of the Scriptures, in the places before mentioned, needs no great pains to evince. In that *1 Kings* 8. 27. the designe of *Solomon* in the words gives light to the substance of what he asserted, he had newly with labour, cost, charge, and wisdome, none of them to be parallel'd in the world, built a *Temple* for the worship of God; The house being large, and exceedingly glorious, the apprehensions of all the Nations round about, (that looked on, and considered the worke he had in hand,) concerning the Nature, and Being of God, being grosse, carnall, and superstitious, themselves answerably, worshipping those, *who by nature were not God*, & his own people of Israel, exceedingly prone to the same abominations, least any should suppose, that he had thoughts of including the *Essence of God* in the house that he had built; he cleares himselfe in this confession of his Faith, from all such imaginations; affirming that though indeed God would *dwell* on the Earth, yet he was so farre from being limited unto, or circumscribed in the House that he had built, that the *Heavens, even the Heaven of Heavens*, any space whatever that could be imagined, the highest Heavens, could not, cannot containe Him, so far is he from having a certaine place in Heaven, where he should reside, in distinction from other places, where he is not; *He is God in Heaven, and in Earth, Josh.* 2. 11. That which the Temple of God was built unto, that the Heaven & the Heaven of Heavens cannot containe: Now the Temple was built to the *Being of God*, to *God as God*. so *Act.* 7. 47. *But Solomon built him an House. Him v.* 48. that is, *the most High, who dwelleth not*, (is not circumscribed) *in Temples made with hands.*

§ 23. That of the 139. *Psalme* is no lesse evident; The *presence*, or *face* of God, is expressly affirmed to be every where: *Whether shall I goe from thy face, if I ascend up into Heaven thou art there, if I goe into hell behold thou art there.* As God is affirmed to be in Heaven, so every where else, now that he is in Heaven, in respect of his Essence and being, is not questioned.

§. 24. Neither can that of the Prophet *Isa.* 66. 1. be otherwise understood, but as an ascribing an *Ubiquity* to God, and a presence in Heaven and Earth: *Heaven is my throne, and the Earth is my footstoole*; the words are *Metaphorical*, and in that way expressive of the Presence of a person; and so God is present in Heaven and

and Earth. That the *Earth* should be his *foote-stoole*, and yet himselfe be so inconceivably distinct frō it, as the Heaven is from the Earth, (a nex pression chosen by himselfe, to set out the greatest distance imaginable) is not readily to be apprehended. *He is not farre from any one of us, for in him we live, and move, and have our being.* *Acts* 17. 27, 28.

The Testimony which God gives to this his perfection in *Jerem.* 23. 23, 24. is not to be avoided; more then what is here spoken by God himselfe, as to his omnipresence, we cannot, we desire not, to speake; *can any one lye hid from me? doe not I fill Heaven and Earth saith the Lord?* Still where mention is made of the presence of God, thus Heaven and Earth (which two are comprehensive of, and usually put for, the whole creation) are mentioned; and herein he is neither to be thought *afarre off*, or *neere*, being equally present every where, in the hidden places, as in Heaven; that is, He is not distant from any thing or place; though he take up no place, but is nigh all things, by the infiniteness, and existence of his being. §. 25.

From what is also known of the Nature of God, His Attributes, and perfections; The Truth delivered may be farther argued, and confirmed. As §. 26.

1. God is absolutely perfect; whatever is of perfection, is to be ascribed to him; otherwise he could neither be absolutely selfe sufficient, all-sufficient, nor eternally blessed in himselfe; He is *absolutely* perfect, in as much as no perfection is wanting to him; and *comparatively* above all that we can conceive, or apprehend of Perfection. If then *Vbiquity* or *omnipresence* be a perfection, it no lesse necessarily belongs to God, then it does to be perfectly good and blessed. That this is a perfection, is evident from its contrary. To be limited, to be circumscribed, is an imperfection and argues weakeneſſe. We commonly say, we would do such a thing in such a place, could we be present unto it: and are grieved and troubled that we cannot be so; that it should be so, is an imperfection attending the limitednesse of our natures. Unlesse we will ascribe the like to God, his Omnipresence is to be acknowledged. If every Perfection then be in God (and if every perfection be not in any, he is not God) this is not to be denyed by Him.

2. Againe: If God be now in a certaine place in Heaven, §. 27.

I aske where he was before these Heavens were made: These Heavens have not alwaies been: God was then where there was nothing but God: no Heaven, no Earth, no Place; in what place was God, when there was no place? When the Heavens were made, did he cease this manner of being in Himselfe, existing in his owne Infinite Essence, and remove into the New place made for him? Or is not Gods removall out of his existence in Himselfe, into a certain place, a blasphemous imagination? *Ante omnia Deus erat, solus ipse sibi, & locus, & mundus, & omnia. Tertul.* Is this change of place and posture to be ascribed to God? Moreover, if God be now only in a certain place of the Heavens, if he should destroy the Heavens, and that place, where would he then be? In what place? Should he cease to be in the place wherein he is, and begin to be in, to take up, and possesse another? And are such apprehensions suited to the infinite perfections of God? Yea may we not suppose, that he may create another Heaven? Can he not doe it? How should he be present there? Or must it stand empty? Or must he move himselfe thither? Or make himselfe bigger then he was, to fill that Heaven also?

§. 28. 3. The Omnipresence of God is grounded on the Infiniteness of his Essence. If God be *Infinite*, he is *Omnipresent*; suppose him *Infinite*, and then suppose there is any thing besides himselfe, and his Presence with that Thing, where ever it be, doth necessarily follow; for if he be so bounded, as to be in his Essence distant from any thing, He is not Infinite. To say God is not Infinite in his Essence, denies him to be Infinite, or Unlimited in any of his Perfections or Properties; and therefore indeed upon the matter *Socinus* denies Gods Power to be Infinite, because he will not grant his Essence to be. (*Catech: cap:* 11. *part.* 1.) That which is absolutely Infinite, cannot have its residence in that which is finite and limited; so that if the Essence of God be not Immense, and Infinite, his Power, Goodnesse, &c. are also bounded and limited; so that there are, or may be many things, which in their own Natures are capable of Existence, which yet God cannot do, for want of Power. How suitable to the Scriptures & common notions of Mankind, concerning the Nature of God, this is, will be easily known. It is yet the cõmon Faith of Christians, that God is ἀσώματος, καὶ ἄπειρος.

4.

4. Let Reason (which the Author of these Catechisms, pretends to advance and honour, (as some think above its due) & therefore cannot decline its dictates) judge of the consequences of this grosse apprehension concerning the *confinement of God to the Heavens*, yea a *certaine place in the Heavens*, though He glister never so much in Glory, there where he is. For first, he must be extended as a body is, that so he may fill the place, and have parts as we have, if he be circumscribed in a certain place; which though our Author think no absurdity, yet as we shall afterwards manifest, it is as bold an attempt to make an *Idoll* of the living God, as ever any of the Sonnes of men engaged into. 2. Then Gods Greatnesse & ours as to Essence, & Substance, differ only gradually, but are still of the same kind. God is bigger then a man it is true, but yet with the same kind of greatnesse, differing from us as one man differs from another. A man is in a certaine place of the Earth, which he fills and takes up: and God is in a certaine place of the Heavens, which He fills and takes up; only some graduall difference there is; but how great or little that difference is, as yet we are not taught. 3. I desire to know of M. B. what the Throne is made of that God sits on in the Heavens and how farre the *Glistering of his Glory* doth extend, and whither that *Glistering of Glory* doth naturally attend his person, as beames doe the sunne, or shining doth fire, or can He make it more or lesse as He pleaseth. 4. Doth God fill the whole Heavens, or only some part of them? If the Whole, being of such substance as is imagined, What roome will there be in Heaven for any body else? Can a lesser place hold him? Or could He fill a greater; if not, how came the Heavens so fit for him? Or could he not have made them of other dimensions lesse or greater? If he be only in a [f] part of Heaven, as is more then innuated in the expression, *that He is in a certaine place in the Heavens*: I aske why he dwells in one part of the Heavens rather then another? Or whether he ever removes, or takes a journey, as *Elijah* speakes of *Baal* 1 *Kings* 18. or is eternally, as limited in, so confined unto, the certaine place wherein He is? Againe how doth he work out those effects of Almighty power, which are at so great a distance from Him, as the Earth is from the Heavens, which cannot be effected by the intervenience of any created power: as the Resurrection of the dead, &c. The Power of

§. 29.

[f] *Si spatium vacat super caput Creatoris, & si Deus ipse in loco est, erit jam locus ille major & Deo & mundo; nihil enim non majus est id quod capit, illo quod capitur.* Tertul. ad Max. lib. 1. cap. 15.

God doubtleſſe followes his Eſſence: and what this extends not to, that cannot reach. But of that which might be ſpoken to vindicate the Infinitely Glorious being of God, from the Reproach, which His own Word is wreſted to caſt upon Him, this that hath been ſpoken is ſomewhat, that to my preſent thoughts doth occure.

§. 30. I ſuppoſe that M B knowes, that in this his circumſcription of God to a certain place, he tranſgreſſes againſt the common conſent of Mankind; if not, a few inſtances of ſeverall ſorts, may I hope, ſuffice for his conviction; I ſhall promiſcuouſly propoſe them, as they lye at hand, or occurre to my remembrance. For the Jewes, [g] *Philo* gives their judgement: Heare (ſaith he) of the Wiſe God, that which is moſt true, that God is in no place; for He is not Contained, but containeth all. That which is made, is in a place; for it muſt be contained, and not containe. And it is the obſervation of [h] another of them, that ſo often as מקום a place, is ſaid of God, the exaltation of his Immenſe, and Incomparable eſſence, (as to its manifeſtation) is to be underſtood. And the Learned [i] *Buxtorfe* tells us, that when that word is uſed of God, it is by an *Antiphraſis*, to ſignify that he is Infinite, *Illocall*, received in no place, giving place to all. That known ſaying of *Empedocles* paſſed among the [k] Heathen, *Deus eſt circulus, cujus centrum ubiq;, circumferentia nuſquam.* And of *Seneca*: *Turne which way thou wilt, thou ſhalt ſee God meeting thee; nothing is empty of him, he fills his own worke.* All things are full of God, ſaies the [l] Poet: and [m] another of them,

Eſtq; Dei ſedes niſi Terra, & Pontus, & Aer,
Eſt Cœlum, & verſus ſuperos, quid quærimus ultra:
Jupiter eſt quodcunq; vides, quocunq; moveris.

Of this *Preſence* of God (I ſay) with, and unto all *things*, of the *Infinity* of his Eſſence, the very Heathens themſelves, by the light of Nature, (which Mr B. herein oppoſes) had a knowledge: hence did ſome of them terme him κοσμοποιὸς νῦς. a mind framing the Universe: and affirmed him to be Infinite: *Primus omnium rerum deſcriptionem & modum, mentis Infinitæ in ratione deſignari & confici voluit.* ſaies *Cicero* of *Anaxagoras*: *Tull: de nat. Deor. lib.* 1. all things are diſpoſed of, by the vertue of our Infinite mind:

g Ἄτοπον περὶ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος Θεοῦ ῥῆσιν ἀληθεστάτην, ὅτις ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐστι. καὶ οὐ περιέχεται, ἀλλὰ περιέχει τὰ πάντα τὸ ὢν γενόμενον ἐν τόπῳ· περιεχέσθαι γὰρ αὐτὸ, ἀλλ' οὐ περιέχειν ἀναγκαῖον. *Philo. lib. 2. Alleg. Leg.*

h Maimon: Mor. Neuoch p. 1 c. 8.

i Buxtorf. in Lexic. verbo מקום

k *Quocunq; te flexeris, ibi illum (Deum) videbis occurrentem tibi, nihil ab illo vacat, opus ſuum ipſe implet.* Senec. de benef. lib. 4. cap. 8.

l *Jovis omnia plena.* Virg. Eclog. 3.

m Lucan lib. 3.

and

and *Plutarch* expressing the same thing, saies he is, νῦς καθαρὸς, καὶ ἀκρατὸς καὶ ἐμμεμιγμένος πᾶσι a pure & sincere mind, mixing it selfe, and mixed (so they expressed the presence of the Infinite mind) with all things: so *Virgil*: *Jovis omnia plena*: all things are full of God: (for God they intended by that name *Acts* 17. 25, 28. 29. and saies *Lactantius*, *Convicii de uno Deo, cum id negare non possunt, ipsum se colere affirmant, verum hoc sibi placere, ut Jupiter nominetur.* lib. 1. c. 2.) Which as *Servius* on the place observes, he had taken frō *Aratus*, whose words are. Ἐκ διὸς ἀρχώμεθα, τὸν οὐδέ ποτ' ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν ἄϊδριν· μεσταὶ δὲ διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαὶ, πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραὶ, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα, καὶ λιμένες. πάντη δὲ διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες; giving a full description, in his way, of the Omnipresence and Ubiquity of God. The same *Virgil*, from the *Platonicks*, tells us in another place.

Spiritus intus alit, totamq; infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem.

And much more of this kind might easily be added. The Learned know where to find more for their satisfaction: and for those that are otherwise, the cleare Texts of Scripture, cited before, may suffice.

§. 31. Of those on the other hand, who have no lesse grossely, and carnally, then he of whom we speake, imagined a [n] diffusion of the substance of God through the whole Creation, and a mixture of it with the Creatures, so as to [o] animate, and enliven them in their severall formes, making God an Essentiall part of each creature, or dreame of an assumption of Creatures, into an unity of Essence with God, I am not now to speake.

[n] Vide Beza. Epist. ad Philip. Marnix.

[o] Vide Virgil. Ænead. lib. 6 principio cælum &c. ex Platonicis.

CAP. III.

Of the Shape, and Bodily visible figure of God.

§. 1. I M. *Biddles Question.*
S God in the Scripture said to have any
Likenesse,
Similitude,
Person,
Shape.

§. 2. The Proposition which he would have to be the *Conclusion* of the Answers to these Questions, is this, *That according to the Doctrine of the Scriptures, God is a person shaped like a man.* A conclusion so grossely absurd, that it is refused as ridiculous, by *Tully an Heathen*, in the person of *Cotta* (*de Nat. Deorum*) against *Velleius* the *Epicurean*; the *Epicureans* only amongst the *Philosophers*, being so sottish, as to admit that conceipt. And M.B. charging that upon the Scripture, which hath been renounced by all the [a] Heathens, who set themselves studiously to follow the light of nature, and by a strict Inquiry to search out the Nature and Attributes of God, principally attending that safe Rule of ascribing nothing to him, that eminently included *imperfection*, hath manifested his pretext of *meere Christianity*, to be little better then a cover for downe right *Atheisme*, or at best, of most vile, and unworthy thoughes of the divine Being. And here also doth M. B. forsake his [b] Masters. Some of them have had more reverence of the Deity, and expresse themselves accordingly, in expresse oppositon to this grosse figment.

a *Sine Corpore ullo Deum esse vult, ut Græci dicunt ἀσώματον. Tull. de Nat. Deor.* lib. 1. *de Platone. mens soluta & libera, segregata ab omni concretione mortali.* id.

b *Ex his autem intelligitur, membra humani Corporis, quæ Deo in sacris literis ascribuntur, uti & partes quædam aliarum animantium, quales sunt ala, non nisi improprie Deo tribui. Siquidem a spiritus natura prorsus abhorrent. Tribuuntur autem Deo per metaphoram cum metonymia conjunctam. Nempe quia facultates vel actiones Deo conveniunt, illarum similes, quæ membris illis, aut insunt, aut per ea exercentur: Crellius de Deo sive de vera Relig.* lib. 1. cap. 15. pag. 107.

§. 3. According to the *Method* I proceeded in, in consideration of the *precedent Questions*, shall I deale with this; and first, consider briefely the *Scriptures* produced to make good this monstrous, horrid Assertion. The places urged & insisted on of old, by the [c] *Anthropomorphites*, were such as partly ascribed *a shape* in generall to God; partly such as mention the parts and Members of God, in that *shape*: His *Eyes*, his *Armes*, his *Hands*, &c. from all which they looked on him, as an *old man, sitting in Heaven on a Throne.* A conception that M. B. is no stranger to. The places of the first sort are here only insisted on by M. B. and the attribution of a *Likenes, Image, Similitude, Person* & *Shape* unto God, is his warrant to conclude, that he hath a *Visible, Corporeall Image*, & *Shape*, like that of a man, which is the plaine intendment of his Question. Now if the *Image, Likeneese, or Similitude*, attributed to God as above, do no way, neither in the summe of the *words* themselves, nor by the intendment of the *Places*, where they are used

c Epiphan. Tom. 1. lib. 3. Heref. 70. Theodoret. lib. 4. cap. 10.

used, in the least ascribe, or intimate, That there is any such *Corporeall, visible Shape in God*, as he would Insinuate, but are properly expressive of some *other* thing, that properly belong to him, I suppose it will not be questioned, but that a little matter will prevaile with a person, desiring to emerge in the world by *novelyes*, and on that account casting off that Reverence of God, which the first and most *Common notions* of mankind would instruct him into, to make bold with God and the *Scripture*, for his own ends & purposes.

I say then first in generall, if the Scripture maybe allowed to expound *it selfe*, it gives us a faire and cleare account of its own intendment, in mentioning the Image and Shape of God, which man was created in; and ownes it to be his *Righteousnesse* and *Holinesse*, in a state whereof, agreeable to the condition of such a creature, man being created, is said to be created in the *Image*, & *Likenes* of God; in a kind of resemblance unto that *Holines* & *Righteousnes* which is in him *Eph.* 4. 23, 24, &c. what can hence be concluded, for a Corporall *Image*, or Shape, to be ascribed unto God, is too easily discernable: From a *likenes* in some *vertue or Property*, to conclude to a *Likenes in a bodily shape*, may well befit a man, that cares not what he saies, so He may speak to the derogation of the Glory of God. §. 4.

2. For the particular places by M. B. insisted on, and the words used in them, which he layes the streese of this proposition upon: The two first words, are דמות and צלם both of which are used in the 1. *Gen.* the word דמות is used *Gen.* 5. 1. and צלם *Gen.* 9. 7. but whither of these *words* do in their *genuine* signification, imply any *Corporeity* or *Figure*, The most learned of all the Rabbins, and most *critically skilfull* in their Language, hath observed and proved, that the proper *hebrew word*, for that kind of outward forme or similitude, is תאר: and if these be ever so used, it is in a *metaphoricall* and borrowed sence, or at least, there is an *Amphiboly* in the words; the Scripture sometimes using them in such subjects, where this grosse *Corporeall sence* cannot possibly be admitted. כדמות נחש *like the Serpent Psal.* 58, 4. here is indeed some *Imaginable*, or rather *rationall resemblance* in the properties there mentioned, but noe corporeall similitude. *vide Exe.* 1. 28. and 23. 15. To which may be added many more places, where if דמרת shall be interpreted of §. 5.

a *bodily similitude*, it will afford no tollerable sence. The same likewise may be said of תמונה. It is used in the *Hebrew* for the *essentiall forme*, rather then the *figure or shape*: & being spoken of men, signifies rather their *soules*, then *body*; so it is used *Psal.* 73. 20. which is better translated, *thou shalt despise their soule*, then their *Image*: so where it is said *Psal.* 39. 6. *every man walketh in a vaine shew*; (the same word againe) however it ought so to be interpreted, it cannot be understood of a *corporeall similitude*; so that these testimonys are not at all to his purpose. What indeed is the *Image* of *God*, or that *likenesse* to him, wherein man was made, I have partly mentioned already, and shall farther manifest (*chap.* 2.) and if this be not a *bodily shape*, it will be confessed, that nothing can here be concluded for the attribution of a *shape* to God; And hereof an account will be given in its proper place.

§. 6. The summe of M. B's reasoning from these places is, God in the creation of the lower world, and the inhabitancy thereof, making *man*, enduing him with a mind and soule, capable of knowing him, serving him, yeilding him voluntary and rationall Obedience, creating him in a condition of *Holinesse and Righteousnesse, in a resemblance* to those blessed perfections in himselfe, requiring still of him to be *holy as he is holy*, to continue & abide in that likenes of his, giving him in that estate, *Dominion* over the rest of his workes here below, is said to create him in his own Image, and *Likenesse*, He being the *Soveraigne Lord* over all his Creatures, Infinitely wise, knowing, Just, and Holy: therefore he hath a *bodily shape and Image*, and is therein like unto a man, *quod erat demonstrandum.*

§. 8. The next quotation is, from *Numb.* 12. 7, 8. where it is said of *Moses*, that he shall behold the *Similitude of the Lord*, the word is *Themunah*, which as it is sometime taken for a *Corporeall Similitude*, so it is at other times for that *Idea*, whereby things are Intellectually represented; in the former sence is it frequently denyed of God, as *Deut.* 4. 16. *you saw no similitude, &c.* But it is frequently taken in the other sence, for that *Object*, or rather *impression*, whereby our intellectuall apprehension is made: as in *Job* 4. 16. an Image was before mine eyes *viz* in his dreame: which is not any *Corpereall shape*, but that *Idea*, or objective re-

pre-

presentation, whereby the mind of man understands its object: that which is in the *Schooles* commonly called *Phantasme*, or else an *intellectuall species*, about the notion of which it is here improper to contend. It is manifest, that in the place here alleadged, it is put to signify the cleare manifestation of Gods Presence to *Moses*, with some such glorious *Appearance* thereof, as he was pleased to represent unto him, Therefore doubtlesse *God hath a bodily shape.*

His next quotation is taken from *Ja.* 3.9. *made after the Similitude of God.* Τοὺς καθ' ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ γεγονότας: Certainely M. B. cannot be so ignorant, as to think the word ὁμοίωσις, to include in its signification a *Corporeall similitude*; the word is of as large an extent as *Similitude* in Latin: and takes in as well those *abstracted Analogies*, which the understanding of man finds out, in comparing severall objects together, as those other *outward conformities* of *figure* and *shape*, which are the the objects of our carnall eyes. It is the word by which the *Septuagint* use to render the word דמות, of which we have spoken before. And the examples are innumerable in the *Septuagints Translation*, & in Authours of all sorts, written in the Greeke Language, where that word is taken at large, & cannot signify a *Corporeall Similitude*, so as it is in vaine to insist upon particulars; and this also belongs to the same head of inquiry with the former, *viz. what likenesse of God it was*, that man was created in, whether of Eyes, Eares, Nose, &c. or of *Holinesse*, &c. §. 8.

His next Allegation is from *Job.* 13.7,8. *will yee accept his Person*, הקניו πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. An allegation so frivolous, that to stand to answer it studiously would be ridiculous. 1. It is an Interrogation, and doth not assert any thing. 2. The thing spoken against is προσωπληψία, which hath in it no regard to *shape* or *Corporeall Personality*, but to the partiality, which is used in preferring one before another in Justice. 3. The word mentioned, with its derivatives, is used in as great, or greater, variety of *metaphoricall Translations*, then any other *Hebrew* word; and is by no meanes determined to be a *signification* of that *bulkey substance*, which with the soule concurres to make up the person of man. It is so used *Gen.* 33.18. את־פני *Jacob pitched his Tent before* (or in the face of) *the City*. It is confessed,

that it is very frequently translated πρόσωπον by the Seventy; as it is very variously Translated by them sometimes ὁ ὀφθαλμός, see *Jer.* 38 26. *Neh.* 2.13. *Joh.* 16.16. *Deut.* 2-36. *Prov.* 27.23. Besides that, it is used in many other places for ἐνώπιον, ἐναντί, ἀπεναντί, ἐπάνω, ἐνώπιον: and in many more sences; so that to draw an *Argument* concerning the nature of God, from a Word so *amphibologicall*, or of such frequent Translation in *metaphoricall speech*, is very *unreasonable*.

§. 9. Of what may be hence deduced this is the summe, in every *plea* or contest about the wayes, dispensations, and judgements of God, that which is right, exact, and according to the thing it selfe, is to be spoken, His Glory not standing in the least need of our flattery or lying; therefore God is such a person, as hath a *bodily shape and similitude*, for there is no other person, but what hath so.

His last Argument is from *Joh.* 5. 37. *Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape*, ὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε. But it argues a very great ignorance in all Philosophicall, and accurate writings, to appropriate εἶδος to a *Corporeall shape*, it being very seldome used, either in Scripture, or else where, in that notion. The Scripture having used it, when that sence cannot be fastened on it, as in the 1 *Th.* 5. 22. ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε: which may be rendered; *Abstaine from every kind, or every appearance*, but not from every *shape* of *evill*: and all other Greeke Authors, who have spoken *accurately*, and not *figuratively* of things, use it perpetually almost in one of those two sences, & very seldome, if at all, in the other.

§. 10. How improperly, & with what little *Reason*, these places are Interpreted of a corporeall similitude, or shape, hath been shewed: wherein the *Image* of God consists, the [a] Apostle shewes, as was declared, determining it to be in the *Intellectuall* part, not in the *Bodily* Col. 3. 10. Ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον (ἄνθρωπον) τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν, κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν. The word here used εἰκὼν, is of a grosser signification then εἶδος, which hath its originall from the *Intellectuall operation* of the mind. yet this the Apostle determines to relate to the mind, and Spirituall excellencies, so that it cannot from the places he hath mentioned, with the least Colour of Rea-

[a] Plato *said the same thing expressly*, apud Stobæum, Eclogæ Ethicæ *l.* 2. *c.* 3 *p.* 163.

Reason be Concluded, that God hath a *Corporeall* [a] *Similitude, Likeneſſe, Perſon, or Shape.*

[a] Θεὸς ἐστι πνεῦμα νοερὸν, οὐκ ἔχον μορφὴν. *Poſidonius apud Stobæum. Eclogæ Phyſicæ. lib. 1. c. 1. pag. 2. I confeſſe Epicurus ſaid,* Ἀνθρωποειδὲς εἶναι τὸν θεὸν. *Stobæus ibidem. cap. 3. pag. 5. And poſſibly M. B. might borrow his miſhapen Divinity from him, and the Anthropomorphites: and then we have the pedegree of his wild poſitions. But the more ſober Philoſophers (as Stobæus there tells us) held otherwiſe.* Θεὸν οὐκ ἀπτὸν οὐδὲ ὁρατὸν, οὐδὲ μεκτὸν, οὐδὲ διαστατὸν, οὐδὲ ἄλλῳ τινὶ σώματι ὁμοιον &c. *which Guil. Canterus renders thus,* Quod nec tangi, nec cerni poteſt Deus, neq; ſub menſuram, vel terminum cadit aut Alicui eſt Corpori ſimile.

§. 13. What hath already been delivered concerning the *Nature of God*, and is yet neceſſarily to be added, will not permit, that much be peculiarly ſpoken to this head, for the removall of thoſe *Imperfections* from him, which neceſſarily attend that *Aſſignation of a bodily Shape* to him, which is here aimed at. That the *Ancient of daves*, is not really, one in the ſhape of an *old man*, ſitting in Heaven on a Throne, *Gliſtering* with a Corporeall Glory, his *haire* being *white*, and his Raiment beautifull, is Sufficiently evinced, from every property, and perfection, which in the Scripture is aſſigned to him.

The holy Ghoſt ſpeaking in the Scripture concerning God, doth not without *Indignation* ſuppoſe any thing to be *Likened* or compared to him, *Maimonides* hath obſerved, that theſe words *Aph Ira, &c.* are never attributed to God, but in the caſe of *Idolatry*; that never any [b] *Idolater* was ſo filly, as to think that an *Idoll* of wood, ſtone, or mettall, was a God that made the Heavens & Earth, but that through thē, all Idolaters intend to worſhip God. Now to fancy a *Corporeity* in God, or that he is like a Creature, is greater, and more *irrationall* diſhonour to him, then Idolatry. *To whom will yee liken God, or what likeneſſe will yee compare to Him? Iſa. 40. 18. Have yee not known, have ye not heard, hath it not beene told you from the beginning, have yee not underſtood from the foundation of the Earth? v. 22. it is He that ſitteth &c. to whō then will ye liken me, or ſhall I be equall ſaith the holy one?* Becauſe the Scripture ſpeakes of the *Eyes, and Eares, Noſtrells, and Armes* of the Lord, and of mans being made *after his likeneſſe*, if any one ſhall [c] conclude, that he *ſees, heares, ſmells*, and hath the ſhape of a man, He muſt upon the ſame reaſon conclude, that

[b] *Videſis Rab. M. Maimonid. de Idolat. §. 2, 3. &c. & Notas Dionyſii Voſſii ibidem.*

[c] *Quæ de Deo dicuntur in ſacro codice ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, interpretanda ſunt θεοπρεπῶς.*

He hath the shape of a *Lion*, of an *Eagle*, and is like a *drunken man*, because in Scripture he is compared to them, & so of necessity make a monster of Him, and worship a *Chimera*.

Nay the Scripture plainly interprets it selfe, as to these Attributions unto God; *his arme is not an arme of flesh*, 2 *Chro.* 32. 8. *Neither are his eyes of flesh, neither seeth he as man seeth Job.* 10. 4. Nay the highest we can pretend to (which is our way of understanding,) though it hath some resemblance of him, yet falls it Infinitely short of a likenesse, or equality with Him. And the Holy Ghost himselfe gives a plaine interpretation of his own intendment in such expressions. For whereas *Luk.* 11. 20. our Saviour sayes, that he with the finger of God casts out Divells, *Math.* 12. 28. He affirmes, that He did it by the Spirit of God, intending the same thing. It neither is, nor can righteously be required, that we should produce any place of Scripture, expresly affirming, that God hath no *Shape*, nor *Hands*, nor *Eyes* as we have, no more then it is, that He is no *Lyon* or *Eagle*: it is enough that there is that delivered of him abundantly, which is altogether inconsistent with any such Shape, as by M. B. is fancied: and that so eminent a difference, as that now mentioned, is put between his *armes*, & *eyes*, & ours, as manifests them to agree in some *Analogy* of the thing signifyed by them, and not in an Answerableness in the same kind; wherefore I say, that

§. 14. The Scripture speaking of God, though it condescends to the nature and *capacityes* of men, and speakes for the most part to the *Imagination* (farther then which, few among the Sonnes of men were ever able to raise their *cogitations*,) yet hath it clearely delivered to us such *Attributes* of God, as will not consist with that *grosse notion* which this man would put upon the Godhead. The *Infinity*, and *Immutability* of God, do manifestly overthrow the Conceipt of a Shape and forme of God. Were it not a contradiction that a body should be actually *infinite*, yet such a body could not have a shape, such an one as He imagines. The *shape* of any thing, is the *figuration* of it: the *figuration* is the *determination* of its *extension* towards severall parts, consisting in a determined proportion of them to each other; that *determination* is a bounding and limiting of them; so that if it have a shape, that will be limited, which was sup-

Vid. D. Bannes in 1. partem Aquinatis. Quæst. 3. Art. 1. & Scolasticos Passim

posed

posed to be *Infinite*; which is a manifest contradiction. But the Scripture doth plainely shew that God is *Infinite* and Immense, not in *magnitude* (that were a contradiction, as will appeare anone) but in *Essence*: speaking to our *fancy*, it saith, that he is *higher then Heaven, deeper then Hell*, *Job* 11. 8. that *He fills Heaven and Earth*, *Ierem.* 23. 24. *That the Heaven of Heavens cannot containe God*, 1 *King.* 8 27. And hath many expressions to shaddow out the Immensity of God, as was manifest in our consideration of the last *Query*. But not content to have yeilded thus to our *Infirmity*, it delivers likewise in plaine and literall termes, the *Infiniteness of God*. *His understanding is infinite Ps.* 147. 5. And therefore his Essence is necessarily so: this is a consequence that none can deny, who will consider it; still he understands the termes of it, as hath been declared. Yet least any should hastily apprehend, that the Essence of God were not therefore necessarily infinite, the *Holy Ghost* saith, *Ps.* 135. 3. *That his greatnesse hath no end*, or is *unconceivable*, which is Infinite. For seeing we can carry on our thoughts, by *calculation*, *potentially in Infinitum*, (that is, whatever measure be assigned, we can continually multiply it by greater and greater numbers (as they say) *in infinitum*: it is evident, that there is no greatnesse, either of *magnitude* or *Essence*, which is unsearcheable or *unconceivable*, beside that which is *actually Infinite*: such therefore is the *greatnesse of God*, in the strict and literall meaning of the Scripture: and therefore that he should have a *shape* implyes a contradiction. But of this so much before, as I presume we may now take it for granted.

§ 15. Now this Attribute of *Infinity*, doth immediately and *demonstratively* overthrow that grosse conception of an humane shape we are in the consideration of, and so it doth by consequence overthrow the conceipt of any other, through a *Spherical shape*. Againe,

Whatever is *incorporeall* is destitute of *shape*; what ever is *Infinite* is *Incorporeall*, therefore what is *Infinite*, is destitute of *Shape*.

All the Question is of the *minor proposition*. Let us therefore suppose an *Infinite body*, or *line*, and let it be bisected; either then, *each halfe* is equall to the *whole*, or lesse. If *equall*, the *whole* is equall to the *parts*; if lesse, then that halfe is *limited* within certaine bounds

bounds: and consequently is *finite*, and so is the other halfe also: Therefore two things which are *finite* shall make up an *Infinite*; which is a contradiction.

Having therefore proved out of Scripture, that God is *Infinite*, it followes also, that he is *Incorporeall*, & that he is without *Shape*.

§. 16. The former Argument proved him to be without such a *shape*, as this Catechist would Insinuate: *this*, that he is without any shape at all. The same will be proved from the *Immutability* or *impassibility* of Gods Essence, which the Scripture assignes to him. *Mal.* 3. 6. *I am the Lord I change not. The Heavens are the worke of thy hand, they shall perish, but thou endurest, they shall be changed, but thou art the same Psal.* 102. 26.

If he be *immutable*, then he is also *incorporeall*, and consequently without *Shape*.

The former consequence is manifest, for every body is *extended*, and consequently is capable of *division*, which is *mutation*; wherefore being *immutable* he hath no *Shape*.

§. 17. M. *Biddle's* great plea for the considering his Catechisme, & insisting upon the same way of inquiry with himselfe, is from the successe, which himselfe hath found in the discovery of sundry Truths, of which he gives an account in his booke, to the Reader. That among the glorious discoveries made by him, the particular now insisted on is not to be reckoned, I presume M. B. knoweth. For this discovery, the world is beholding to one *Audæus* a Monke, of whom you have a large account in *Epiphanius Tom.* 1. *lib.* 3. *Hæres.* 70. as also in *Theodoret. lib.* 4. *Eccles Hist. cap.* 10. who also gives us an account of the man, and his conversation, with those that followed him. *Austin* also acquaints us with this worthy Predecessor of our Author *de Hæres cap.* 50. He that thinks it worth while to know, that we are not beholding to M. B. but to this *Audæus* for all the Arguments, whither taken from the creation of man in the Image of God, or the attibution of the parts and members of a man unto God in the Scripture, to prove him to have a visible Shape, may at his leasure consult the Authors above mentioned, who will not suffer him to ascribe the praise of this discovery to M. B's ingenious inquiryes. How the same figment was also entertained by a company of stupid *Monkes* in *Ægypt*, who in pursuit of their opinion came in a great drove to *Alexandria*

d Οὕτως ὀφθῆναι ἐδόκει ὡς θεὸν πρόσωπον. Zozom. Hist. Lc. l. 8. c. 11. §. 18.

e Minut. Felix. in Octav. Lactan. de vera sap. Matius pansa Pianensis de cultu ethnicæ & Christianæ Theol. c. 25. Origen. in Gen. Hom. 3. August: l. 83. Quæst. 22.

dare to knock *Theophilus* the Bishop on the head, who had spoken against them, and how that crafty companion deluded them with an ambiguity[d] of expression, with what learned strife ensued thereon, we have a full relation in *Socrat. Eccles. Hist. lib. 6. cap. 7.*

As this madnesse of brainsick men, was alwayes rejected by all[e] Persons of sobriety, professing the Religion of Jesus Christ, so was it never embraced by the Jewes, or the wiser sort of Heathens, who retained any impression of those common notions of God, which remaine in the hearts of men. The Jewes to this day do solemnely confesse in their publicke worship, that God is not corporeall, that he hath no corporeall propriety, and therefore can nothing be compared with him. So one of the most learned of them of old. Οὔτε γὰρ ἀνθρωπόμορφός ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς, οὔτε θνητὸς ἀνθρώπινον σῶμα *Phil. de opificio mundi.* Neither hath God an humane forme, nor does an humane body resemble him. And in *Sacrifi. Abel.* οὐδὲ τὰ ὅσα ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι θεοῦ κυριολογεῖται, καταχρήσει δὲ ὀνομάτων ὅτι παρηγορεῖται τῷ ἡμετέραν ἀσθένειαν. Neither are those things which are in us[e] spoken properly of God, but there is an abuse of names (therein) relieving our weakenesse.

Likewise the Heathens, who termed God νοῦν, & ψύχωσιν, & πνεῦμα & δυναμώτιον or δύναμιν, had the same apprehensions of him: thus discourses *Mercurius ad Tatium, in Stobæus: serm. 78.* Θεὸν μὲν νοῆσαι χαλεπὸν, φράσαι δὲ ἀδύνατον· τὸ γὰρ ἀσώματον σώματι σημῆναι ἀδύνατον· καὶ τὸ τέλειον τῷ ἀτελεῖ καταλαβεῖν ἀ δυνατὸν. καὶ τὸ ἀίδιον τῷ ὀλιγοχρονίῳ συγγενέσθαι, δύσκολον. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀεί ἐστι, τὸ δὲ παρέρχεται. καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς ἐστὶ, τὸ δὲ ὑπὸ φαντασίας σκιάζεται. τὸ δὲ ἀσθενέστερον τῆς ἰσχυροτέρας, καὶ τὸ ἔλαττον τῆς κρείττονος & διέσηκε πόσῳ, ὅσον τὸ θνητὸν τῆς θείας. οὐδὲ μέση τούτων διάσασις, ἀμαυροῖ πᾶν τὸ καλὸν θέαν. ὀφθαλμοῖς μὲν γὰρ τὰ σώματα θεατὰ, γλώττῃ δὲ τὰ ὁρατὰ, λεκτὰ, τὸ δὲ ἀσώματον καὶ ἀφανὲς, καὶ ἀχρήματιστον, καὶ μήτε ἐξ ὕλης ὑποκείμενον, ὑπὸ σῶν ἡμετέρων αἰσθήσεων καταληφθῆναι ἀ δύναται. Ἐννοεῖται δ' Τατ' ἐννοεῖται, ὃ ἐξεπίτηδες ἀ δυνατὸν, τοῦτό ἐστιν ὁ Θεός. And *Calicratides apud Stob. Serm. 83.* Τὸ δὲ ἓν ἐστιν ἀεὶ ὂν αὐτὸς, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κατὰν ἔννοιαν, ζῶον ἀγήρων, ἄφθαρτον, ἀρχέτε καὶ αἰτία τῆς ὅλων διακοσμήσεως.

Of the like import is that Distick of *Xenophones* in *Clemens Alexan: Strom. 5.*

Εἷς θεὸς ἔν τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος
Οὔτε δέμας θνητοῖσιν ὁμοῖος, οὐδὲ νόημα.
There is one Great God, among Gods and men,
who is like to mortalls neither as to body nor mind.

Whereunto answers that in *Cato*,

Si Deus est animus nobis ut carmina dicunt. &c.

And *Æschylus* in the same place of *Clemens* Strom. 5.

Χώρειτε θνητῶν τὸν θεὸν καὶ μὴ δόκει
Ὅμοιον αὐτῷ σαρκικὸν καθεστάναι.
Seperate God from mortalls, and think not thy selfe of flesh, like him.

And *Posidonius* plainly in *Stobæus* as above, ὁ θεὸς ἔστι πνεῦμα νοερὸν καὶ πυρῶδες, οὐκ ἔχον μορφήν, *God is an intelligent fiery spirit, not having any shape.* And the same Apprehension is evident in that of *Seneca*, *Quid est Deus? mens universi. Quid est Deus? Quod vides totum, & quod non vides totum. Sic demum magnitudo sua illi redditur, quâ nihil majus excogitari potest. Si solus est omnia, opus suũ extra & intra tenet. Quid ergo interest inter naturam Dei & nostram? Nostri melior pars animus est, in illo nulla pars extra animum. Natural. Quæst. lib. 1. Præfat.* It would be burdensome, if not endlesse, to insist on the Testimonyes, that to this purpose might be produced, out of *Plato*, *Aristotle*, *Cicero*, *Epictetus*, *Julius Firmicus*, and others of the same order. I shall close with one of *Alcinous de Doctrina Platon. cap.* 10. Ἄτοπον δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐξ ὕλης εἶναι καὶ εἴδους. ἢ γὰρ ἔσται ἀσύνθετος καὶ ἀρχικὸς. *It is absurd to say that God is of matter and forme: for if so, he could neither be simple, nor the principall cause.*

§. 19. The thing is so cleare, and the contrary even by the *Heathen Philosophers* accounted so absurd, that I shall not stand to pursue the arguments flowing from the other Attributes of God, but proceed to what followes.

CAP. IV.

Of the Attribution of Passions, and Affections, Anger, Feare, Repentance unto God: in what sence it is done in the Scripture.

§. 1. THIS next inquiry about the Nature of God, respects the Attribution of severall Affections and Passions unto him in the

the Scripture, of whose sence and meaning he thus expresseth his apprehension.

Quest. *Are there not according to the perpetuall tenor of the Scriptures, affections and passions in God, as Anger, Fury, Zeale, Wrath, Love, Hatred, Mercy, Grace, Jealousy, Repentance, Grief, Joy, Feare?* Concerning which he labours to make the Scriptures determine in the affirmative. §. 2.

The maine of M. B's designe in his Questions about the Nature of God, being to deprive the Deity of its distinct *Persons*, its *Omnipresence, Prescience*, and therein all other infinite Perfections, he endeavours to make him some recompence for all that losse, by ascribing to him in the foregoing Query, a *Humane visible shape*, and in this, *Humane, turbulent affections, and passions*; commonly where men will not ascribe to the Lord that which is his due, [a] He gives them up to assigne that unto Him, which he doth abhorre. Neither is it easily determinable, whether be the greater abomination. By the first, the dependance of men upon the true God is taken off; by the latter, their hope fixed on a false. This on both sides at present is M. B's sad employment: The Lord lay it not to his charge, but deliver him from the snare of Sathan, wherein he is [b] *taken alive* at his pleasure. §. 3.

[a] Jer. 44. 15, 16.

[b] 2 Tim. 2. 26.

2. The things here assigned to God are ill assotiated, if to be understood after the same manner. Mercy, and Grace, we acknowledge to be Attributes of God; the rest mentioned, are by none of M. B's Companions, esteemed any other, then Acts of his will: and those *Metaphorically* assigned to him. §. 4. Crellius de *Deo seu vera Relig.* cap. 29. p. 295.

3. To the whole I aske, whither these things are in the *Scriptures* ascribed *properly* unto God, denoting such *affections* & *passions* in him, as those in us are, which are so termed, or whither they are assigned to Him, & spoken of him *Metaphorically*, only in reference to his outward workes and dispensations, correspondent and answering to the actings of men, in whom such affections are, and under the power whereof they are in those actings. If the latter be affirmed, then as such an attribution of them unto God, is eminently consistent with All his Infinite Perfections, and Blessednesse, so there can be no difference about this Question, and the answers given thereunto; all men readily acknowledging, that in this sence the Scripture doth ascribe all the affections mentioned unto God; of which we say as He of old, ταῦτα ἀνθρωποπαθῶς μὲν λέγονται, θεοπρεπῶς δὲ νοοῦνται. §. 5.

νοοῦνται. But this I feare will not serve M. B's turne: the very *Phraise* and manner of expression, used in this question; the plaine intimation that is in the forehead thereof, of its Authors going off frō the cōmon received interpretation of these Attributions unto God, do abundantly manifest, that it is their proper significancy which he cōtends to fasten on God, & that the affections mentioned are really and properly in Him, as they are in us. This being evident to be his mind and intendment, as we think his *anthropopathisme* in this Query, not to come short in folly and madnesse of his *anthropomorphisme* in that foregoing: so I shall proceed to the removall of this insinuation in the way and method formerly insisted on.

§. 6. M. *Biddle*'s Masters tell us, that [d] *These affections are vehement commotions of the will of God, whereby He is carryed out earnestly to the object of his desires, or earnestly declines, and abhors, what falls not out gratefully, or acceptably to him.* I shall first speake of them in generall, and then to the particulars, (some or all) mentioned by M. *Biddle*.

d *Voluntatis divinæ Commotiones, præsertim vehementiores, seu actus ejusmodi, quibus voluntas vehementius vel in objectum suum fertur, vel ab eo refugit, atq; abhorret &c.* Crell. de Deo: seu Vera Relig. cap: 29. p: 295. vid: *etiam* cap: 30, 31.

1. In Generall, that God is perfect and perfectly Blessed, [e] I supose will not be denyed; it cannot be, but by denying that he is God. He that is not perfect in himselfe, and perfectly Blessed, is not God. To that which is perfect in any kind, nothing is wanting in that kind. To that which is *absolutely* perfect, nothing is wanting *at all*. He who is blessed, is perfectly satisfied, & filled, & hath no farther desire for supply. He who is blessed in himself, is Alsufficient for himself. If God want, or desire any thing for himselfe, he is neither perfect nor blessed. To ascribe then affections to God properly, (such as beforementioned) is to deprive him of his perfection and blessednesse. The Consideration of the nature of these, and the like Affections, will make this evident.

e Deut. 32. 4. Job. 37. 16. Rom. 1. 25. 9. 5. 1 Tim. 1. 11. 6. 15.

§. 7. 1. Affections considered in themselves, have alwayes an incompleat, imperfect act of the will, or volition joyned with them. They are [f] something that lyes between the firme purpose of the soule, and the execution of that purpose: The proper actings of affections lye between these two; that is, in an incompleats

f Crellius de Deo ubi supra

incōpleat, tumultuary volition. That God is not obnoxious to such *volitions*, & incompleat actings of the will, besides the generall consideration of his perfections, & blessednes premised, is evident frō that manner of procedure which is ascribed to him. His purposes and his workes comprise all his actings. As the Lord hath [g] *purposed* so hath he done. *He worketh all things according to the Counsell of his will.* Who hath known his mind, and who hath been his Councellour. Of him, and from him are all things.

g Isa. 14. 24. Eph. 1. 11. Ro. 11. 33, 34, 35. Isa. 40. 13.

2. They have their dependance on that, wherewith he, in whom they are, is affected; that is, they owe their rise & continuance to some thing without him, in whom they are. A mans feare ariseth from *that*, or *them*, of whom he is afraid; by them it is occasioned, on them it depends; what ever affects any man, (that is the stirring of a suitable Affection) in all that frame of mind, and soule, in all the volitions and commotions of will, which so arise from thence, he depends on something without him. Yea our being affected with something without, lyes at the bottome of most of our purposes and resolves; Is it thus with God? With Him, who is [h] *I Am?* Is he in dependance upon any thing without him? Is it not a most eminent contradiction, to speake of God, in *dependance* on any other thing? Must not that thing either be God, or reduced to some other, without, and besides him, who is God? As the causes of all our affections are. *God is of one mind, and who can turne him: whatever he pleaseth that he doth.*

§. 8.

h Exod. 3. 14.

Job. 23. 13.

3. Affections are necessarily accompanied with *change* and *mutability*. Yea he who is affected properly, is really changed: yea there is no more unworthy change or alteration, then that which is acompanied with passion, as is the change, that is wrought by the affections, ascribed to God. A [i] sedate, quiet, considerate alteration, is farre lesse inglorious, and unworthy, then that which is done in and with passion: Hitherto we have taken God upon his Testimony, That He is the [k] *Lord, and he changeth not*: that with him *there is neither change nor shaddow of turning*: it seemes like the wormes of the earth, He varieth every Day.

§. 9.

i Τί ἂν ἀσέβημα μεῖζον γένοιτο, τοῦ ὑπολαμβάνειν τὸ ἄστρεπτον τρέπεσθαι. Philo.

k Mal. 3. 6.

4. Many of the affections here ascribed to God, do eminently de-

§. 10.

denote *impotence*, which indeed on this account, both by *Socinians* and *Arminians* is directly ascribed to the Almighty. They make him *affectionately*, and with *Commotion* of will, to desire many things, in their own Nature not impossible, which yet he cannot accomplish nor bring about; of which I have elsewhere spoken. Yea it will appeare, that the most of the Affections ascribed to God by M. *Biddle*, taken in a proper sence, are such as are actually ineffectuall, or commotions through disappointments, upon the account of impotency, or defect of power.

Corol. *To ascribe affections properly to God, is to make him weake, imperfect, dependant, changeable, and impotent.*

§. 11. 2. Let a short view be taken of the particulars, some or all of them, that M. *Biddle* choseth to instance in; *Anger, Fury, wrath, Zeale*, (the same in kind, only differing in degree and circumstances,) are the first he instances in; and the places produced to make good this Attribution to God, are, *Numb.* 25. 3,4. *Ezek.* 5. 13. *Exod.* 32. 11,12. *Rom.* 1. 18.

1. That mention is made of the Anger, Wrath, and Fury of God, in the Scripture, is not questioned, *Numb.* 25. 4. *Deut.* 13. 11. *Josh.* 1. 26. *Psal.* 18. 29. *Isa.* 13. 9. *Deut.* 29. 24. *Judg.* 2. 14. *Psal.* 14. 1. *Psal.* 69. 24. *Isa.* 30. 30. *Lament.* 2. 6. *Ezek.* 5. 15. *Psal.* 18. 49. *Isa.* 34. 2. 2 *Chron.* 28. 11. *Ezra.* 10. 14. *Hab.* 3. 8. 12. are farther Testimonies thereof. The words also in the Originall, in all the places mentioned, expresse or intimate perturbation of mind, Commotion of Spirit, corporall mutation of the parts of the body, & the like distempers of men, acting under the power of that passion. The whole difference is about the intendment of the Holy Ghost in these Attributions, and whether they are properly spoken of God, asserting this passion to be in him, in the proper significancy of the words, or whether these things be not taken ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, and to be understood θεοπρεπῶς, in such a sence, as may answer the meaning of the figurative expression, assigning them their truth to the utmost, and yet be interpreted in a suitablenesse to divine perfection and blessednesse.

§. 12. 2. The *Anger* then which in the Scripture is assigned to God, we say denotes two things.

1.

1. His *Vindictive Justice*, or constant and immutable will of rendering vengeance for sinne: so Gods purpose of the demonstration of his Justice, is called his being *willing to shew his wrath or anger Rom.* 9. 22. so Gods Anger and his Judgements are placed together *Psal.* 7. 6. and in that anger he judgeth, *v* 8. and in this sence is the wrath of God said to be revealed from Heaven, *Rom.* 1. 18. that is, The *Vindictive Justice* of God against sinne, to be manifested in the effects of it, or the Judgments sent, and punishments inflicted on, & throughout the world.

Vid. Andr. Rivetum in Psal. 2. p. 11. & in Exod. 4. p. 15 & Aquinat. 1. part. Q. 3. Art. 2. ad secundum. *Ira dicitur de Deo Secundum similitudinem effectus, quia proprium est Irati punire, ejus ira punitio Metaphorice vocatur.*

2. By Anger Wrath, Zeale, Fury, the effects of Anger are denoted. *Rom.* 3. 5. Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? The words are, ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν, who inflicteth, or bringeth anger on man: that is, sore punishments, such as proceed from Anger, that is, Gods *Vindictive Justice*. And *Eph.* 5. 6. For this cause cometh the *wrath of God upon the Children of disobedience:* Is it the passion or affection of Anger in God, that M. *Biddle* talkes of, that comes upon the Children of Disobedience? Or is it indeed the [a] effect of his Justice for this sin? Thus the day of Judgment is called the *day of wrath*, and of *anger*, because it is the day of the *Revelation of the Righteous Judgment of God Rom.* 2. 5 After thy hardnesse &c. In the place of *Ezekiel*, *chap.* 5. 13. mentioned by M. B. The Lord tells them, he will *cause his fury to rest upon men*; and accomplish it upon them. I aske whether he intends this of any passion in him, (and if so, how a passion in God can rest upon a man) or the Judgments which for their iniquities he did inflict? We say then, Anger is not properly ascribed to God, but *metaphorically*, denoting partly his vindictive Justice whence all punishments flow, partly the effects of it in the punishments themselves, either threatned, or inflicted, in their terrour and bitternesse, upon the account of what is Analogous therein to our proceeding, under the power of that passion; and so is to be taken in all the places mentioned by M. *Biddle*. For §. 13.

[a] Ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ *Divina ultio* Rom. 1. 8. Col. 3. 6. Grotius *in Locum*.

3. Properly, in the sence by him pointed to, *anger, wrath, &c.* are not in God. Anger is defined by the Philosopher to be, ὄρεξις μετὰ λύπης τιμωρίας φαινομένης, διὰ φαινομένην ὀλιγωρίαν, *Desire joyned with*

grife

griefe of that which appeares to be revenge, for an appearing neglect, or contempt. To this [l] griefe he tells you there is a kind of pleasure annexed, arising frō the vehement fancy which an angry person hath of the revenge he apprehends as future; which saith he, *is* [m] *like the fancy of them that dreame*: and ascribes this passion mostly to *weake impotent Persons*; Ascribe this to God, and you leave him nothing else; There is not one Property of his nature wherewith it is consistent. If he be Properly, and litterally *angry*, and *Furious*, and *wrathfull*, he is *moved, troubled, perplexed, desires revenge*, and is neither *blessed*, nor *perfect*; but of these things in our generall Reasons against the property of these Attributions afterwards.

[l] Ἡ ὅσον τότε ἐγγινομένη φαντασία ἡδὸν ἣν ποιεῖ, ὥσπερ ἡ τῶν ἐνυπνίων. *Aristot. lib. 2. cap. 2.*

[m] Διὸ κάμνοντες, πενόμενοι, ἐρῶντες, διψῶντες, ὅλως ἐπιθυμοῦντες, καὶ μὴ κατορθοῦντες, ὀργίλοι εἰσὶ, *id. ubi sup.*

4. M. *Biddle* hath given us a rule in his preface, that when any thing is ascribed to God in one place, which is denyed of him in another, then it is not properly ascribed to him: Now God sayes expressly, that *fury*, or *anger is not in him*, *Isa.* 27. 4. and therefore it is not properly ascribed to him.

§. 14. 5. Of all the places where mention is made of Gods *repentings* or his *Repentance*, there is the same Reason. *Exod.* 32. 14. *Gen.* 6. 6, 7. *Judges* 10. 16. *Deut.* 30. 9. are produced by M. B. That one place of the 1 *Sam.* 15. 29. where God affirmes, that he *knoweth no Repentance*, casts all the rest under a necessity of an interpretation suitable unto it. Of all the affections or passions, which we are obnoxious to, there is none that more eminently proclaimes imperfection, weakenesse, and want in sundry kinds, then this of Repentance. If not sinnes, mistakes, and miscarriages, (as for the most part they are,) yet disapointment, griefe, & trouble are alwayes included in it. So is it in that expression *Gen.* 6. 6. *It* [a] *repented the Lord that he had made man on the*

[a] Theodoret upon on this place tells us οὐ μὴν, ὡς τινὲς φασιν, &c. *Non autem ut fuerunt quidam*, (so that M. B. is not the first that held this opinion) *Irâ quadam & pænitentiâ ductus Deus hæc egit*: ταῦτα γὰρ τοι ἀνθρώπινα πάθη ἡ δὲ θεία φύσις ἐλευθέρα παθῶν. And then he adds, τί δήποτε τοίνυν &c. *Quomodo ergo pænitentia cadat in Deum?* His answer is, οὐκ οὖν ἐπὶ θεοῦ μεταμέλεια, &c. *Quare pænitentia Dei nihil aliud est, quam mutatio Dispensationis eius. Pænitet me (inquit) quod constituerim Saul Regem, pro eo quod est, statui illum deponere. Sic in hoc loco, (Gen. 6. 6.) pænitet fecisse me hominem; hoc est, decrevi perdere humanum genus.* Theod. in Gen. Quæst. 50. Tom. opū. 1. p. 41, 42.

Earth

Earth, and it grieved him at the heart. What but his mistake, and great disappointment, by a failing of wisdome, foresight, and power, can give propriety to these Attributions unto God? The Change God was going then to worke in his Providence on the earth, was such, or like that, which men do, when they *repent* of a thing, being *grieved at the heart* for what they had formerly done. So are these things spokē of God, to denote the *kind of the things which he doth*, not the nature of God himselfe; otherwise such expressions as these would suit him, whose frame of spirit & heart is so described: *Had I seen what would have bin the Issue of making man, I would never have done it. Would I had never been so overseen as to have engaged in such a businesse. What have I now got by my rashnesse? nothing but sorrow and griefe of heart redounds to me.* And do these become the Infinitely blessed God?

6. *Feare* is added, from *Deut.* 32. 26, 27. Feare, saith the Wise man, is a *betraying of those succours which reason offereth:* natures avoidance of an impendent evill. [n] Its contrivance to fly and prevent what it abhors, being in a probabillity of coming upon it: a turbulent weakenesse. This God forbids in us, upon the account of his being our God, *Isa.* 35. 4. *Feare not O worme Jacob &c.* Every where he asserts feare to be unfit for them, who depend on him, and his helpe, who is able, in a moment to dissipate, scatter, and reduce to nothing, all the causes of their feare. And if there ought to be no feare, where such succour is ready at hand, sure there is none in him who gives it. Doubtlesse it were much better to exclude the Providence of God out of the world, then to assert him *afraid* properly, & directly of future events. The Schooles say truly *Quod res juni futuræ, a voluntate Dei est, (effectiva vel permissiva)* How then can God be affraid of what he knowes will, and purposeth shall come to passe? He doth, he will do things in some likenesse to what we do, for the prevention of what we are afraid of. He will not scatter his people, that their Adversaries may not have advantage to trample over them. When we so act as to prevent any thing, that (unlesse we did so act) would befall us, it is because we are afraid of the coming of that thing upon us: Hence is the reason of that attribution unto God; That properly he should be afraid of what comes to passe, who [o] knowes frō eternity what will so

§. 15.

[n] Ἐγὼ δ' φόβος, λύπη τις ἢ ταραχὴ ἐν φαντασίας μέλλοντος κακοῦ ἢ φθαρτικοῦ, ἢ λυπηροῦ. *Arist. Rhetor. l. 2. c. 6.*

[o] Act. 15. 18. 2 Sam. 22. 16. Job. 4. 9. Psal. 18 15. Rom. 1. 21. Gen. 17. 1. Rom. 9. 16, 17, 18, &c. & 11. 34, 35, 36. Isa. 40. 15. Heb. 1. 3. Ps. 33. 9. Act. 17. 25, 28. Ps. 50, 8. Dan. 6. 23 Ps. 90. 3. Job. 34. 19.

do

do, who can with the breath of his mouth destroy all the objects of his dislike, who is infinitely wise, blessed, all sufficient, and the soveraigne disposer of the lives, breath, and wayes, of all the sons of men, is fit for M. B. and no man else to affirme. All the Nations are before him, as the drop of the bucket, and the dust of the ballance, as vanity, as nothing; he upholds them by the word of his power, *in him all men live, & move, & have their being*, & can neither live, nor act, nor be without him: their life, & breath, and all their wayes, are in his hands, he brings them to destruction, and sayes returne yee children of men; and must he needs be properly afraid of what they will doe to him, and against him?

§ 16. 7. Of Gods Jealousy, and hatred, mentioned, from *Psal.* 5. 4, 5. *Exod.* 20. 5. *Deut.* 32. 21. There is the same reason. Such effects as these things in us produce, shall they meet withall, who provoke him by their blasphemies and abominations. Of Love, Mercy, and Grace, the condition is something otherwise; principally they denote Gods Essentiall goodnesse & kindnesse, which is eminent amongst his Infinite perfections: and secundarily, the effects thereof, in, and through Jesus Christ, are denoted by these expressions. To manifest, that neither they nor any thing else, as they properly intend any affections or passions of the mind, any commotions of will, are properly attributed to God, unto what hath been spoken allready, these ensuing Considerations may be subjoyned.

§. 17. 1. Where no cause of stirring up affections or passions can have place, or be admitted, there no affections are to be admitted: For to what end should we suppose that, whereof there can be no use to eternity. If it be impossible any affection in God should be stirred up, or acted, is it not impossible any such should be in him? The causes stirring up all affections, are the accesse of some good desired, whence *Joy*, *Hope*, *Desire*, &c. have their spring: or the approach of some evill to be avoided, which occasions *Feare*, *Sorrow*, *Anger*, *Repentance*, and the like. Now if no good can be added to God, whence should joy, and desire be stirred up in him: If no evill can befall him, in himselfe, or any of his concernments, whence should he have *Feare*, *Sorrow*, or *Repentance*. P Our goodnesse extends not to him; He hath no need of us, or our Sacrifices. *Can a man be profitable to God, as he that*

p Psal. 16. 2. 50. 8, 9, 10. Job 35. 6, 7, 8 Job 22. 2, 3.

that is wise may be profitable to himselfe. Is it any pleasure to the Almighty that thou art Righteous, or is it gaine to him that thou makest thy wayes perfect?

2 The *Apostle* tells us, that God is blessed for ever, *Ro.9.5.* He is the blessed & only potentate, *1 Tim.6.15* God Allsufficient, *Gen. 17.1* That which is inconsistent with *absolute Blessednes, & Allsufficiency* is not to be ascribed to God; to do so, casts him down frō his excellency. But can he be blessed, is he Allsufficient, who is tossed up and down with *Hope, Joy, Feare, Sorrow, Repentance, Anger*, and the like? doth not Feare take off from absolute Blessednesse? Grant that Gods feare doth not long abide, yet whilst it doth so, He is lesse blessed then he was before, and then he is, after his feare ceaseth. When He *Hopes*, is He not short in happinesse of that condition, which he attaines in the enjoyment of what he hoped for? And is He not *lower*, when He is disappointed, and falls short of his expectation? Did ever the Heathens speak with more contempt of what they worshipped? Formerly the pride of some men heightened them to fancy thēselves to be like God, without passions or affections; being not able to abide in their attempt against their own sence and experience; it is now endeavoured to make God like to us, in having such passions & affections. My ayme is brevity, having many heads to speake unto: Those who have written on the Attributes of God, his Selfe-sufficiency, & Blessednesse, Simplicity, Immutability, &c. are ready to tender farther satisfaction, to them who shall desire it. §. 18. Psal. 50.21.

CAP. V.

Of Gods Prescience or Fore-knowledge.

HIS next attempt is to overthrow, and remove the *Prescience*, or fore-knowledge of God; with what successe, the farther consideration of the way whereby he endeavours it, will manifest. His *Question* (the engine whereby he workes) is thus framed. §. 1.

As for our free Actions, which are neither past, nor present, but may afterwards

terwards either be or not be, what are the chiefe passages of Scripture from whence it is wont to be gathered, that God knowe h not such actions untill they come to passe, yea that there are such actions?

That we might have had a clearer acquaintance with the intendment of this interrogation, it is desirable M. B. had given us his sence on some particulars, which at first view present themselves; to the trouble of every ordinary Reader. As

1. How we may reconcile the words of Scripture given in answer to his preceding Querie, with the designe of this. There it is asserted, that God *understands our thoughts* (which certainely are of our free actions, if any such there are) *afarre off*; Here, that he knowes not our free Actions, that are *future*, and not yet wrought or performed.

§. 2. 2. By whom is it *wont to be gathered* from the following Scriptures, *that God knoweth not our free actions untill they come to passe*: Why doth not this *meere Christian*, that is of no Sect, name his Companions and Associates in these learned Collections from Scripture? Would not his so doing discover him to be so farre from a *meere Christian*, engaged in none of the Sects, that are now amongst Christians, as to be of that Sect, which the residue of men so called, will scarce allow the name of a Christian unto.

a Stegman. Photin. Refut Disput. 1. q. 2.

An Photiniani ullo modo Christiani dici queant. Neg. Martin. Smiglec. Jes. *Nova monstra, novi Arianis.* cap. 1. *Arianos nullo modo Christianos dici posse.*

3. What he intends by the close of his *Querie*, *yea that there are such actions*; An advance is evident in the words towards a farther negation of the knowledge of God, then what was before expressed. Before he sayes, *God knowes not our actions that are future contingent*: Here, he knowes not that there are such actions. The sence of this must be, either that God knowes not that there any such actions, as may, or may not be, which would render him lesse knowing then M. B. who hath already told us, that such there be; or else that he knowes not such actions when they are, at least without farther enquiring after them, and knowledge obtained, beyond what from his owne infinite perfections, and Eternall purpose he is furnished withall. In M. *Biddles* next booke or *Catechisme*, I desire he would answer these questions also.

Now

Now in this endeavour of his, M. B. doth but follow his leaders. [b] *Socinus* in his his Prelections, where the maine of his deligne, is to vindicate mans free-will, into that latitude and absoluteneſſe, as none before him had once aymed at, in his 8th *Chapter* objects to himſelfe this fore-knowledge of God, as that which ſeemes to abridge, and cut ſhort the liberty contended for; He Anſwers, that he grants not the fore-knowledge pretended, and proceeds, in that and the two following Chapters, labouring to anſwer all the Teſtimonyes, and Arguments which are inſiſted on for the proofe and demonſtration of it; giving his owne Arguments againſt it, *Chapter* 11. [c] *Crellius* is ſomething more candid as he pretends, but indeed infected with the ſame venome with the other; for after he hath diſputed for ſundry pages, to prove the fore knowledge of God, he concludes at laſt, that for thoſe things that are future contingent, he knowes only, that they are ſo, & that poſſibly they may come to paſſe, poſſibly they may not. Of the reſt of their Aſſociates few have ſpoken expreſsly to this thing. [d] *Smalcius* once and againe manifeſts himſelfe to conſent with his Maſters, in his diſputations againſt *Franzius*, expreſsly conſenting to what *Socinus* had written in his Prelections, and affirming the ſame thing himſelfe, yea diſputing eagerly for the ſame opinion with him.

b *Ut ad rationem iſtam non minus plenè quam planè reſpondeamus, animadvertendum eſt, infallibilem iſtam Dei prænotionem, quam pro re conceſsâ adverſarii ſumunt, a nobis non admitti.* Socin Prælec. c. 8. p. 25. *Cum igitur nulla ratio, nullus Sacrarum literarum locus ſit, ex quo apertè colligi poſſit, Deum omnia quæ fiunt, ſciviſſe antequam fierent, concludendum eſt, minimè aſſerendam eſſe a nobis iſtam Dei præſcientiam: præſertim, cùm & rationes non paucæ, & ſacra Teſtimonia non deſint, unde eam planè negandam eſſe apparet:* idem c. 11. p. 38. c *Itaq; in conſideratè ita faciunt qui futura contingentia Deum determinatè ſcire aiunt, quia aliàs non eſſet omniſcius: cum potiùs, ideo illa determinatè futura non concipiat, quia eſt omniſcius:* Crellius de Vera Relig. libr. c. 24 p. 201. d *Nam ſi omnia futura qualiacunq; ſunt, Deo ab omni æternitate determinatè cognita fuiſſe contendas; neceſſe eſt ſtatuere omnia neceſſariò fieri, ac futura eſſe. Undè ſequetur nullam eſſe, aut fuiſſe unquam, humanæ voluntatis libertatem, ac porrò nec Religionem.* idem ibid. p. 202. Smalcius Refutat. Theſ. Franz. diſput. 1. de Trinitat. pag. 3. diſput. 12. de cauſ. peccat. p. 428, 429. &c. 435.

For the vindication of Gods *fore-knowledge*, I ſhall proceed in the ſame order as before, in reference to the other Attributes of God, inſiſted on: *viz.* 1. What M. B. hath done, how he hath diſpoſed of ſundry places of Scripture for the proofe of his aſſertion, with the ſence of the places, by him ſo produced, is to be conſidered. 2. Another Queſtion and Anſwer is to be §. 7.

supplied in the roome of his. 3. The Truth vindicated, to be farther confirmed.

For the First.

§. 5. In the proofe of the Assertion proposed, Mr. B. finds himselfe entangled more then ordinarily; though I confesse his taske in generall be such, as no man, not made desperate by the losse of all, in a *shipwrack* of *Faith*, would once have undertaken. To have made good his proceeding according to his ingagement, he was at least to have given us Texts of Scripture, expresse in the letter, as by him cut off from the state, condition, and coherence, wherein by the Holy Ghost they are placed, for the countenancing of his assertion. But here, being not able to make any work in his method proposed, and boasted in, as signall and uncontroleable; no *apex*, or tittle in the Scripture, being pointed towards the deniall of Gods knowing any thing, or all things, *past*, *present*, & *to come*: He moulds his Question into a peculiar fashion, and askes, *whence*, or from *what place of Scripture may* such a thing as he there averrs, *be gathered*? At once plainly declining the triall he had put himselfe upon, of insisting upon expresse Texts of Scripture only; not one, of the many quoted by him, speaking one word expressely to the businesse in hand, and laying himselfe naked to all consequences, rightly deduced from the Scripture, and expositions, given to
e Rom. 12.6. the letter of some places, suitable to the e *proportion of Faith*. That then which he would have, he tells you, is *gathered* from the places of Scripture subjoyned; but *how*, by *whom*, by what *consequence*, with what evidence of Reason, it is so *gathered*, he tells you not. An understanding indeed informed with such grosse conceptions of the nature of the Deity, as M. B. hath laboured to insinuate into the minds of men, might *gather* from his collection of places of Scripture for his purpose in hand, that God is *afraid*, *troubled*, *grieved*, that he *repenteth*, *altereth*, and *changeth* his mind to and fro; but of his *knowledge*, or *fore-knowledge* of things, whether he have any such thing or not, there is not the least intimation; unlesse it be in this, that if he had any such fore-knowledge, he need not put himselfe to so much trouble and vexation, nor so change, and alter his mind, as he doth. And with such figments as these, through the Infinite, Wise, and good Providence of God, punishing the wantonnesse of the minds

minds, and lives of men, by *f giving them up to strong delusions*, and vaine Imaginations, in the darknes of their foolish hearts, so far, as to change *the glory of the incorruptible God*, into the likenesse of a corruptible, weak, ignorant, sinfull man) are we now to deale.

f 2 Thess. 2. 10, 11, 12. g Rom. 1. 23.

But let the places themselves be considered. To these heads they may be referred. (1.) such as ascribe unto God *fear, and being afraid*: Deut 32. 26, 27. Psal 10. 17. Gen. 3. 22 23. are of this sorte. (2.) *Repentance*: 1 Sam. 15. 10, 11, &c. (3.) *Change, or alteration of mind*: Numb. 14. 27, 30. 1 Sam. 2. 30. (4.) *Expectation*, whether a thing will answer his desire or no: Isa. 5. 4. *Conjecturing*, Jerem. 36. 1, 2, 3. Ezek. 12. 1, 2. (5.) *Trying of experiments*, Judg. 3. 1, 4. Dan. 8. 2. 2 Chron. 32. 31. From all which and the like, it may, by M. B's direction and helpe, be thus gathered: *If God be afraid of what is to come to passe, and repenteth him of what he hath done, when he finds it not to answer his expectation, if he sits divining, and conjecturing at events, being often deceived therein, and therefore tryes and makes experiments, that he may be informed of the true state of things, then certainely he knowes not the free actions of men, that are not yet come to passe.* The Antecedent M. B. hath proved undeniably from ten texts of Scripture; and doubtlesse the consequent is easily to be gathered by any of his Disciples. Doubtlesse it is high time, that the old musty *Catechisms* of prejudicate persons, who scarce so much as once consulted with the Scripture in their composures, as being more engaged into factions, were removed out of the way, and burned, that this *meere Christian*, may have liberty to blesse the growing Generation, with such notions of God, as the *Idolatrous Pagans* of old, would have scorned to have received.

§. 6.

But doe not the Scriptures ascribe all the particulars mentioned unto God? Can you blame M. *Biddle* without reflection on them? If only what the Scripture affirmes in the letter, and not the sence wherein, and the manner how it affirmes it, (which considerations are allowed to all the writings, and speakings of the sonnes of men,) is to be considered, the End seeming to be aimed at in such undertakings, as this of M. B. namely, to induce the Atheistical spirits of the sonnes of men, to a contempt and scorne of them, and their Authority, will probably be sooner attained, then by the efficacy of any one engine raised against them in the world besides.

§. 7.

As

§. 8. As to the matter under consideration; I have some few things in *generall* to propose to M. *Biddle*, and then I shall descend to the *particulars* insisted on.

1. Then, I desire to know whether the things mentioned, as *Feare*, *Griefe*, [h] *Repentance*, *Trouble*, *Conjecturings*, *making trialls* of men for his owne information, are ascribed *properly* to God, as they are unto men, or *tropically* and figuratively, with a condescention to us, to expresse the things spoken of, and not to describe the nature of God? If the first be said, namely, that these things are ascribed properly to God, and really signify of him, the things in us intended in them, then to what hath been spoken in the consideration taken of the foregoing Querie, I shall freely adde, for mine owne part, I will not own, nor worship him for my God, who is *truly* and *properly* affraid what all the men in the world either will, or can do; who doth, can do, or hath done any thing, or suffered any thing to be done, of which he doth, or can truly and properly *repent* himselfe, with sorrow and griefe for his mistake; or that sits in Heaven *divining*, and *conjecturing* at what men will doe here below: and do know, that He whom *I serve in my spirit, will famish and starve all such Gods out of the world.* But of this before. If these things are ascribed to God *figuratively*, & *improperly*, discovering the kind of his workes, and dispensations, not his own *Nature* or *Properties*; I would faine know what inference can be made, or conclusion be drawn from such expressions, directly calling for a *figurative interpretation?* For instance, if God be said to *repent* that he had done such a thing, because such and such things are come to passe thereupon, if this *Repentance* in God, be not properly ascribed to him (as by M. B's owne rule it is not) but denotes only an alteration & change in the works, that outwardly are of him[i], in an orderly subserviency to the immutable *purpose* of his will, what can thence be gathered to prove, that God *foreseeth not the free actions of men*? And this is the Issue of M. *Biddles* confirmation of the *Thesis*, couched in his Query insisted on, from the Scriptures.

h *Pœnitentia infert ignorantiam præteriti, præsentis, & futuri, mutationem voluntatis, & errorem in consiliis, quorum nihil in Deum cadere potest: dicitur tamen ille metaphorice pœnitentiâ duci, quemadmodum nos, quando alicujus rei pœnitet, abolemus id quod antea feceramus: quod fieri potest sine tali mutatione voluntatis, quâ nunc homo aliquid facit, quod post mutato animo, destruit.* Manasseh Ben. Izrael. conciliat. in Gen. 6. q: 23. *Pœnitentia, cum mutabilitatem importet, non potest esse in Deo, dicitur tamen pœnitere, eo quòd ad modum pœnitentis se habet, quando destruit quod fecerat.* Lyran. ad. 1 *Sam.* 15. *v* 35.

2.

§. 9. 2. I must crave leave once more to mind him of the Rule he hath given us in his Preface, *viz* That where *a thing is improperly ascribed to God, in some other place it is denyed of him*; as he instances in that of his being *weary*: so that what ever is denyed of him in any one place, is not properly ascribed to him in any other. Now, though God be said in some of the places by him produced, to repent; yet it is in another expresly said, that he doth not do so, and that upon such a generall ground and Reason, as is equally exclusive of all those other *passions*, and *affections*, upon whose assignement unto God, the whole strength of M. *Biddles* plea against the Prescience of God doth depend. 1 *Sam.* 15.29. *Also the strength of Israell will not lye, nor repent, for he is not a man that he should repent.* The immutability of his nature, & unlikenesse to men in obnoxiousnesse to alterations, is asserted as the reason of his not repenting; which will equally extend its force and efficacy, to the removall from him, of all the other *humane affections* mentioned. And this second generall consideration of the foundation of M. B's plea, is sufficient for the removall of the whole.

§. 10. 3. I desire to know, whether indeed it is only the *free actions of men that are not yet done*, that M. B. denyes to be knowne of God? Or whether he exclude him not also from the knowledge of the *present state*, frame and actings of the hearts of men, and how they stand affected towards him: being therein like other Rulers among men, who may judge of the good & evill actions of men, so farre as they are manifest and evident, but how men in their hearts stand affected to them, their Rule, Goverment, and Authority, they know not. To make this enquiry, I have not only the observation premised, from the words of the close of M. *Biddles* Query, being of a negative importance, (*yea that there are such actions*) but also from some of the proofes by him produced, of his former assertion, being interpreted according to the *literall significancy* of the words, as exclusive of any figure, which he inlisteth on. Of this sort is that of *Gen.* 22. 12, 10, 11, 12. [i] where God is said to *tempt Abraham*, and upon

[i] *Ex hac actione propter quam ab omnibus Deum timens vocaberis, cognoscent omnes, quantus in te sit timor Dei, & quousq; pertingat.* R. Mos. Ben Maimon: more Nevoch. p. 3. c. 24.

the

the Issue of that tryall saves to him, (which words M. B. by putting them in a different character, points to, as comprehensive of what he intends to gather, & conclude from them) *NOW I KNOW that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not with-held thy sonne, thine only sonne from me.* The collection which M. B. guides unto from hence, is, *that God knew not that which he enquired after*, and therefore *tempted Abraham* that he might so do, and upon the issue of that tryall saies, *now I know.* But what was it that God affirmes, that now he knew? Not any thing future; not any free action, that was not as yet done; but something of the present condition and frame of his heart towards God: *viz. His feare of God*; not whether he *would feare* him, but whether he *did feare* him then. If this then be properly spoken of God, & really, as to the nature of the thing it selfe, then is he ignorant no lesse of things present, then of those that are for to come. He knowes not who *feares* him, nor who *hates* him, unlesse he have opportunity to try them, in some such way as he did *Abraham*: And then what a God hath this man delineated to us? How like the dunghil Deities of the Heathen who speake after this rate.[k] Doubtlesse the description that *Elijah* gave of *Baal*, would better suite him, then any of those divine Perfections, which the living, all seeing God, hath described himselfe by. But now if M. B. will confesse, that God knowes all the things that are present, & that this enquiry after the present frame of the heart and spirit of a man, is improperly ascribed to him, from the *Analogy* of his proceedings in his dealings with him, to that which we insist upon, when we would really finde out what we doe not know; then I would only aske of him, why those other expressions which he mentions, looking to what is to come, being of the same nature & kind with this, doe not admit of, yea call for the same kind of exposition and interpretation.

[k] *Contigerat nostras infamia temporis aures;*
Quam cupiens falsam summo delabor Olympo,
Et Deus humanâ lustro sub imagine terras.
Ovid.

§. 11. Neither is this the only place insisted on by M. B. where the *inquiries* ascribed unto God, & the tyall that he makes, is not in reference to *things to come*, but punctually to what is present. *Deut.* 8. 2. *chap.* 13 3. *The Lord your God proveth you, to know whether you love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soule.* 2 *Chron.*

2 *Chron.* 32.31. *God left him to try him, that he might know what was in his heart*; and *Phil.* 4.6. *In every thing let your request be made known to God.* Let M. *Biddle* tell us now plainely, whether he suppose all these things to be spoken properly of God, and that indeed God *knowes not our hearts*, the frame of them, nor what in them we desire and aime at, without some eminent tryall & inquiry, or untill we our selves do make knowne what is in them unto him. If this be the mans mind (as it must be, if he be at any agreement with himselfe in his principles, concerning these scripturall Attributions unto God,) for my part, I shall be so farre from esteeming him eminent, as a *meere Christian*, that I shall scarcely judge him comparable, as to his apprehensions of God, unto many that lived and dyed *meere Pagans*. To this sence also is applyed that Property of God, that he *tryeth the hearts*, as it is urged by M. *Biddle* from 1 *Thes.* 2.4, that is, he maketh inquiry after what is in them, which but upon search and tryall, he knoweth not. By what wayes and meanes God accomplisheth this search, and whether hereupon he comes to a perfect understanding of our hearts, or no, is not expressed. *John* tells us, that *God is greater then our hearts, and knoweth all things*; and we have thought on that account, (with that of such farther discoveryes as he hath made of himselfe, and his Perfections unto us,) that he had been said to search our hearts, not that himselfe, for his own information, needs any such formall processe by way of tryall and enquiry, but because really and indeed he doth that in himselfe, which men aime at in the accomplishment of their most dilligent searches, and exactest tryalls.

And we may by the way see a little of this mans consistency with himselfe. Christ he denyes to be God. A great part of his Religion consists in that negative. Yet of Christ it is said, *that he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man*, *John* 2. 24, 25. and this is spoken in reference to that very thing in the hearts of men, which he would perswade us, that God knowes not without inquiry. That is, upon the account of his not *committing* himselfe to those, as true Believers, whom yet upon the account of the profession they made, the Scripture calls so, and sayes, *they believed in his name when they saw the miracles that he did*, v. 23. Though they had such §. 181

a vaile of profession upon them, that the Holy Ghost would have us esteeme them as Believers, yet Christ could looke through it, into their hearts, and discover & know their frame, and whether in sincerity they loved him, and believed in his name or no; but this God cannot do, without enquiry: and yet Christ (if we believe M.B.) was but a *meere man*, as he is a *meere Christian*. Further, it seemes by this Gentleman, that unlesse *we make knowne our requests to God*, he knowes not what we will aske. Yet we aske nothing but what is in our thoughts: and in the last querie he instructs us, that God knowes our thoughts, and doubtlesse knowes M. *Biddles* to be but folly. Further yet, if God must be concluded *ignorant* of our desires; becaus we are bid to *make our requests* knowne to him, He may be as well concluded *forgetfull* of what himselfe hath spoken, becaus he bids us, *put him in remembrance*, and appoints some to be his *Remembrancers*: But to returne.

§. 13. This is the aspect of almost one halfe of the places produced by M. *Biddle*, towards the businesse in hand; if they are properly spoken of God, in the same sence as they are of man; they conclude him not to know *things present*, the frame of the heart of any man in the world towards himselfe, and his feare, nay the outward, open, notorious actions of men. So it is in that place of *Gen.* 18.21. insisted on by [1] *Crellius*, one of M. *B's* great Masters. *I will goe downe and see* (or know) *whether they have done altogether according to the cry that is come up unto me*. Yea the places which in their letter & outward appearance seeme to ascribe that ignorance of *things present* unto God, are farre more expresse and numerous, then those that in the least looke forward to what is yet for to *come*, or was so, at their delivery. This progresse then have we made under our *Catechist*, if we may believe him, as he insinuates his notions concerning God: God, *sits in Heaven* (*glistering on a throne*) whereunto he is limited, yea to a *certaine place* therein, so as not to be elsewere, being *grieved*, *troubled*, and *perplexed*, at the *affaires* done below which he doth know, making inquiry after what he doth not know, and

[1] *Nimis longè à propriâ verborum significatione recedendum est, & sententiarum vis enervanda, si eas cum definitâ illa futurorum contingentium præscientiâ conciliare velis* ut Gen. 18. 21. & 22. 12. *Quicquid enim aliàs de utriusq; loci sententiâ statuas, illud tamen facile est cernere, Deum novum quoddam, & insigne experimentum, illic quidem impietatis Sodomiticæ & Gomorrhææ, videre voluisse, hic verò pietatis Abrahamicæ vidisse, quod antequam fieret, plane certum & exploratum non esset.* Crellius de vera Relig. c. 24. p. 209.

and many things; (*things future*) he knoweth not at all.

Before I proceed to the farther Consideration of that which is eminently, and expressly denyed by M. *Biddle. viz. Gods fore-knowledge of our free actions that are future*, because many of his proofes, in the sence by him urged, seeme to exclude him from an acquaintance with many *things present*, as in particular, *the frame and condition of the hearts of men*, towards himselfe, as was observed; it may not be amisse, a little to confirme that Perfection of the knowledge of God as to those things, from the Scripture, which will abundantly also manifest, that the expressions insisted on by our *Catechist*, are *metaphoricall*, and improperly ascribed to God. Of the eminent predictions in the Scripture, which relate unto things future, I shall speake afterwards. He knew, for he foretold the *Flood*, the destruction of *Sodome* and *Gomorrah*, the *Famine* in *Ægypt*, the selling and exaltation of *Joseph*. the Raigne of *David*, the division of his Kingdome, the *Babylonish* captivity, the Kingdome of *Cyrus*, the returne of his people, the date and ruine of the foure great *Empires* of the world, the Warres, Plagues, Famines, Earthquakes, Divisions, which he manifestly foretold. But farther, he knowes the frame of the hearts of men. He knew that the *Keilites* would deliver up *David* to *Saul* if he staid amongst them, which probably they knew not themselves, 1 *Sam.* 23. He knew that *Hazael* would murther women and infants, which he knew not himselfe. He knew that the *Ægyptians* would afflict his People, though at first they entertained them with Honour, *Gen.* 15. 13. He knew *Abraham*, that he would instruct his household. *Gen.* 18. 19. He knew that some were obstinate, their neck an iron sinew, and their brow brasse *Isa.* 48. 4. He knew the imagination, or figment of the heart of his People, *Deut.* 31. 21. That the Church of *Laodicea* (notwithstanding her profession) was lukewarme, neither hot nor cold, *Rev.* 3. 15. Man looketh on the outward appearance, *God looketh on the heart*, 1 *Sam.* 16. 7. *He only knowes the hearts of all the children of men*, 1 *Kings* 8. 39. *Hell and destruction are before the Lord, how much more then the hearts of the Sonnes of men. Prov.* 15. 11. so also *Prov.* 24. 12. *Jerem.* 17. 9, 10. *Ezek.* 11. 5. *Ps.* 38. 9. *Psal.* 94. 11. *Job.* 31. 4. *Matth.* 6. 4, 6, 8. *Luk.* 16. 15. *Act.* 1. 24. &c. Innumerable other places to this purpose may be insi- §. 14.

sted on: though it is a surprisall to be put to prove, that God knowes the hearts of the Sonnes of men. But to proceed to that which is more directly under consideration.

§. 14. 3. The sole foundation of M. *Biddles* insinuation, that God knowes not our *free actions that are future*, being laid (as was observed,) on the assignation of *Feare*, *Repentance*, *Expectation*, & *Conjecturing* unto God, the consideration which hath already been had of those Attributions in the Scripture, and the causes of them, is abundanly sufficient to remove it out of the way, and to let his inference sinke thither, whence it came. Doubtlesse never was painter so injurious to the Deity (who limned out the shape of an *old man* on a cloth or board, and after some disputes with himselfe, whether he should sell it for an emblem of winter, set it out as a representaton of God the *Father*) as this man is, in snatching Gods own pencill out of his hand, & by it presenting him to the world in a grosse, carnall, deformed shape. *Plato* would not suffer *Homer* in his Commonwealth, for entrenching upon the imaginary blessedness of their dunghill Deities; making [a] *Jupiter* to grieve for the death of *Sarpedon*, *Mars* [b] to be wounded by *Diomedes*, and to roare thereupon, with disputes & [c] conjecturs in heaven among thēselves about the issue of the *Trojan* warre: though he endeavours to salve all his heavenly solecismes, by many noble expressions, concerning purposes not unmeet for a Deity; telling us in the close and Issue of a most contingent affaire, Διὸς δ' ἐτελεείετο βουλή. Let that man think of how much sorer punishment he shall be thought worthy (I speake of the great account he is one day to make) who shall persist in wresting the Scripture to his own destruction, to represent the living and incomprehensible God unto the world, *trembling with feare*, *pale* with *anger*, *sordid* with *griefe*, and *Repentance*, perplexed with conjectures, and various

[a] *Hom: Iliad: Rhapsod.* π. p. 431. &c.

Τὸν δ' ἰδὼν, ἐλέησε Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω.
Ἤρην δ' προσέειπε ----
Ὦ μοι ἐγὼν, ὅτι μοι Σαρπηδόνα φίλτατον ἀνδρῶν,
Μοῖρ' ὑπὸ πατρόκλοιο Μενοιτιάδαο δαμῆναι.

[b] *Hom: Iliad. Rhapsod.* ε. *Ps:* 859.
---- ὁ δ' ἔβραχε χάλκεος Ἄρης
Ὁπόντ' ἐννεάχιλοι ἐπίαχον ἢ δεκάχιλοι
Ἀνέρες ἐν πολέμῳ --- καθέζετο θυμὸν ἀχένων
Δεῖξεν δ' ἄμβροτον αἷμα ---
Καί ῥ' ὀλοφυρόμενος.

[c] *Hom: Iliad. Rhapsod.* δ. *in Princip.*

various expectations of events, and making a diligent enquiry after the things he knowes not, that is altogether such an one as himselfe; let all who have the least reverence of and acquaintance with that Majesty, with whom we have to do, judge and determine. But of these things before.

§. 15. 4. The proposure of a Question to succeed in the roome of that removed, with a Scripturall resolution thereof, in order to a discovery of what God himselfe hath revealed, concerning his knowledge of all things, is the next part of our employment. Thus then it may be framed.

Q. *Doth not God know all things, whether past, present, or to come, all the wayes, and actions of men, even before their accomplishment, or is any thing hid from him? What saies the Scripture properly and directly hereunto?*

Ans. *God is greater then our hearts, and knoweth all things,* 1 *John* 3.20. *Neither is there any Creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked, and open to the eyes of him, with whom we have to do.* *Heb.*4.12. *He is a God of knowledge,* 1 *Sam.* 2.3. *Thou knowest my downsitting, and mine up. rising, thou understandest my thoughts a farre off. Thou compassest my paths, and my lying downe, and art acquainted with all my wayes, for there is not a word in my tongue but O Lord thou knowest it altogether:* *Psal.*139.2,3,4,5. *Great is our Lord, and of great power his understanding is Infinite,* *Psal.* 141.5. Who hath *directed the spirit of the Lord,* or being his Councellour hath taught him? With whom tooke he Councell, or who instructed him, and taught him in the paths of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding? *Isa.*40.13,14. *There is no searching of his understanding v.*28. *Ro.*11.34,35,36. of him are all things; And *Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the World,* Act. 15.18, *&c.*

§. 16. Of the Undeniable evidence and conviction of Gods *Prescience* or *Foreknowledge* of future contingents, from His predictions of their comming to pass, with other demonstrations of the Truth under consideration, attended with their several testimonies from Scripture, the close of this discourse will give a further Account.

It remaines only, that according to the way and method formerly insisted on, I give some farther Account of the Perfection of God pleaded for, with the Arguments wherewith it is farther

farther evidenced to us, and so to proceed to what followeth.

§. 7. 1. That *Knowledge* is proper to God, the testimony of the Scripture unto the excellency and perfection of the thing it selfe, doth sufficiently evince. [o] I cannot tell (saies the Apostle) *God knoweth* 2 *Cor.* 12.2,3. It is the Generall voice of Nature, upon relation of any thing that to us is hid, and unknowne, that the Apostle there makes mention of; GOD KNOWETH. That he knowes the things that are past, M. *B.* doth not question. That at least also somethings that are present, yea some thoughts of our hearts are known to him, he doth not deny. It is not my intendment to engage in any curious Scholasticall discourse about the *understanding*, *science*, *knowledge*, or *Wisdome* of God; nor of the way of Gods knowing things, in, and by, his own Essence through simple intuition. That which directly is opposed, is his knowledg of our *free actions*, which in respect of their second & immediate causes, may, or may not be. This therefore I shall briefely explain, and confirme the truth of it, by Scripure Testimomyes, and Arguments from right Reason, not to be evaded, without making head against all Gods infinite perfections; having already demonstrated, that all thatwhich is insisted on by M. *B.* to oppose it, is spoken metaphorically, and improperly of God.

o *Intellectio secundum se ejus est, quod secundum se optimum est.* Julius Petronellus l. 3. c. 4 ex Arist. Metaph. l. 12. cap. 7.

Sed et intellectum duplicem video; alter enim intelligere potest, quamvis non intelligat, alter etiam intelligit qui tamen nondũ est perfectus, nisi & semper intelligat, & omnia: & ille demum absolutissimus futurus sit, qui & semper, & omnia, & simul intelligat. Maxim. Tyrius. dissertat. 1. *Uno mentis cernit in ictu quæ sint, quæ fuerint, veniantq;* Boeth.

§. 18. That God doth fore-see all future things was amongst meere Pagans so acknowledged, as to be looked on as a common

p Τὶς ἢ μέλλει φρένα δίαν καθορᾶν, ὄψιν ἄβυσσον: *Æschyl.* Δοκεῖ ἢ μοι ὁ καλούμενος θεμὼν, ἀδύνατον τε εἶναι, καὶ νοεῖν πάντα, καὶ ὁρᾶν, καὶ ἀκούειν, καὶ εἰδέναι, τὰ ὄντα, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι. *Hippoc. de Princip.* To the same purpose is that of *Epicharmus*, ἀδὲν ἐκφεύγει τὸ θεῖον, αὐτὸς ἐφ' ἁμῶν ἐπίστας &c. And the *Anonymus Author* in *Stobæus* (*vid. Excerpta Stobæi pag.* 117.) speaking of God adds -- "Ὃν οὐδὲ εἷς λέληθεν οὐδὲν ποιῶν, οὐδ' ἂν ποήσων, οὐδὲ πεποιηκὼς πάλαι: ὁ ἢ παρὼν ἅπαντα χὼ, πάντ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης οἶδε &c. In short, the Pagans generally received custome of consulting Oracles, of using their διανοσκοπία, their *Auguria*, and *Auspicia* &c. by which they expected answers from their Gods, and significations of their will concerning future things, are evident demonstrations that they believed their Gods knew future Contingents.

notion

notion of mankind: So [q] *Zenophon* tells us; That both *Grecians* and *Barbarians* consented in this, that the Gods knew all things present, and to Come. And it may be worth our observation, that whereas [r] *Crellius*, one of the most learned of this Gentlemans Masters, distinguisheth betweene ἐσόμενα, and μέλλοντα, affirming, that God knowes τὰ ἐσόμενα, which though future are necessarily so, yet he knowes not τὰ μέλλοντα, which are only (saies he) *likely* so to be; *Zenophon* plainely affirmes, that all Nations consent, that he knowes τὰ μέλλοντα. And this knowledge of his (saith that great Philosopher,) is the foundation of the Prayers and supplications of men, for the obtaining of good, or the avoiding of evill. Now that one calling himselfe a meere Christian, should oppose a perfection of God, that a meere Pagan affirmes all the world to acknowledge to be in him, would seeme somewhat strange, but that we know all things do not answer, or make good, the names whereby they are called.

q Οὐκοῦν ὡς μὲν καὶ Ἕλληνες, καὶ βάρβαροι θεοὺς ἡγοῦνται πάντα εἰδέναι, τά τε ὄντα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα εὔδηλον· πᾶσαι γοῦν αἱ πόλεις καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη διὰ μαντικῆς ἐπερωτῶσι τοὺς θεοὺς τί τε χρὴ καὶ τὶ οὐ χρὴ ποιεῖν· καὶ μὴν ὅτι νομίζομέν τε δύναμιν αὐτοὺς, καὶ εὖ καὶ κακῶς ποιεῖν, καὶ τοῦτο σαφὲς· πάντες γοῦν αἰτοῦνται τοὺς θεοὺς, τὰ μὲν φαῦλα ἀποτρέπειν τἀγαθὰ δὲ διδόναι. οὔτοι τοίνυν ὃ πάντα εἰδότες. --- διὰ δὲ τὸ προειδέναι καὶ ὁ τὶ ἐξ ἑκάστου ἀποβήσεται. &c. *Zenoph.* ΣΥΜΠΟΣ.

r *Cùm ergo Deus omnia prout reipsâ se habent cognoscat, ἐσόμενα seu certo futura cognoscit ut talia, similiter & μέλλοντα ut μέλλοντα, seu veresimiliter eventura, pro ratione causarum unde pendent.* Crellius de Vera Relig l. 1. c. 24. p. 201.

For the clearer handling of the matter under consideration, the *Termes* wherein it is proposed are a little to be explained. § 12.

1. That *Prescience*, or *Fore-knowledge* is attributed to God, the Scripture testifieth. *Act.* 2. 23. *Rom.* 8. 29. *chap.* 11. 2. 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. are proofes hereof. The terme indeed (Foreknowing) rather relates to the things known, and the order wherein they stand one to another, and among themselves, then is properly expressive of Gods knowledge. God knowes all things as they are; and in that order wherein they stand

stand. † Things that are past, as to the order of the creatures, which he hath appointed to them, and the workes of Providence, which outwardly are of him, he knowes as past: not by Remembrance as we do, but by the same act of knowledge, wherewith he knew them from all Eternity, even before they were. Their existence in time, and being cast by the successive motion of things, into the number of the things that are past, denote an alteration in them, but not at all in the knowledge of God. So it is also in respect of things future. God knowes them in that *esse intelligibile* which they have, as they may be knowne and understood; and how that is, shall afterwards be declared. He sees and knowes them as they are, when they have that respect upon them of being *future*: when they loose this respect by their *actuall existence*, he knowes them still as before. They are altered, his knowledge, his understanding is *infinite*, and changeth not.

† *Sciendum, quòd omnino aliter se habet antiqua vel æterna scientia ad ea quæ fiunt & facta sunt, & aliter recens scientia: esse namque rei entis est causa scientiæ nostræ, scientia vero æterna est causa ut ipsa res sit. Si vero quando res est postquam non erat, contingeret noviter in ipsa scientia antiquâ, scientia superaddita, quemadmodum contingit hoc in scientia nova, sequeretur utiq; quod ipsa scientia antiqua esset causata ab ipso ente: & non esset causa ipsius. oportet ergo quod non contingat ibi mutatio, scilicet in antiqua scientia, quemadmodum contingit in nova: sciendum autem, quod hic error ideirco accidit, quia scientia antiqua mensuratur ab intellectu cum scientia nova, cujus mensurationis modus vitiosissimus est: projicit quippe quandoq; hominem in barathrum, unde nunquam est egressurus.* Rab. Aben. Rost. Interpret. Raymund. Martin. Pugi. Fidei. P. P. cap. 25. Sect. 4, 5. pag. 201.

§. 21. 2. † Gods knowledge of things is either of *Simple intelligence* (as usually it is phrased) or of *vision*. The first is his knowledge of all *possible* things; that is, of all that he himselfe can doe. That God knows himselfe, I suppose will not be denyed. An Infinite Understanding knows throughly all Infinite Perfections. God then knowes his own power, or Omnipotency, and thereby knowes all that he can do. *Infinite science* must know (as I said) what *Infinite power* can extend unto. Now what ever God can do is possible to be done; that is, whatever hath not in itselfe a repugnancy to being. Now that many things may be done by the power of God, that yet are not, nor ever shall be done, I suppose is not denyed. Might he not make a new world? Hence ariseth the Attribution of the knowledge of *simple intelligence*, before mentioned, to God. In his owne infinite understanding he sees, and knowes all things, that are possible

† *In Deo simplex est intuitus, quo simpliciter videntur quæ composita sunt, invariabiliter quæ variabilia sunt, & simul quæ successiva.*

possible to be done by his power, would his good pleasure concurre to their production.

§. 21. Of the world of things possible which God can do, some things, even all that he pleaseth, are [u] *future*. The creation it selfe, and all things that have had a being since, were so *future* before their creation. Had they not sometimes been *future*, they had never been. What ever *is*, *was* to be, before it was. All things that *shall be* to the end of the world are now *future*. How things which were only *possible* in relation to the power of God, come to be *future*, and in what respect, shall be briefely mentioned. These things God knoweth also. His science of them is called, of *vision*. He sees them, as things which in their proper order shall exist. In a word, *Scientia Visionis*, and *Simplicis Intelligentiæ*, may be considered in a threefold relation; that is, in *ordine ad objectum, mensuram, modum*. 1. *Scientia Visionis* hath for its object things past, present, and to come, whatsoever had, hath, or will have actuall being. 2. The measure of this knowledge is his will: because the will, & decree of God onely make those things future, which were but possible before, therefore we say *scientia visionis fundatur in voluntate*. 3. For the manner of it, it is called *scientia libera, quia fundatur in voluntate*, as necessarily presupposing a free act of the divine will, which makes things future, and so objects of this kind of knowledge. 2. That *scientia*, which we call *simplicis intelligentiæ*; the object of it is, *possible*, the measure of it, *Omnipotency*; for by it he knowes all he can do; & for the manner of it, 'tis *scientia necessaria, quia non fundatur in voluntate, sed potestate*: (say the Schoolemen) seeing by it he knowes not what he will, but what he can do. Of that late figment, of a *middle science* in God, arising neither from the *infinite Perfection* of his own being, as that of simple intelligence, nor yet attending his free purpose and decree, as that of Vision, but from a consideration of the second causes that are to produce the things fore-known, in their kind, order, and dependance, I am not now to treat. And with the former kind of knowledge it is, or rather in the former way, (the knowledge of God being simply one and the same) is it, that we affirme him to know the things that are future, of what sort soever, or all things before they come to passe.

[u] *Ad hanc legem animus noster aptandus est, hanc sequatur, huic pareat, & quæcunq; fiunt debuisse fieri putet.* Senec. Epist. 108.

§. 22. 3. The things enquired after are commonly called *contingent*. Contingencyes are of two sorts,

1. Such as are *only* so.
2. Such as are *also free.*

1. Such as are *only* so, are contingent only in their *effects:* such is the *falling of a stone* from an house, and the killing of a man thereby. The *Effect* it selfe was contingent, nothing more; the cause necessary; the stone being loosed from what detained it upon the house, by its own weight necessarily falling to the ground. (2.) That which is so contingent, as to be also *free*, is contingent both in respect of the *Effect*, and of its *Causes* also. Such was the Souldiers piercing of the side of Christ. The effect was contingent, such a thing might have been done, or not: and the cause also, for they chose to doe it, who did it, and in respect of their own elective faculty, might not have chosen it. That a man shall write, or ride, or speake to another person to morrow, the Agent being free, is contingent, both as to the *cause*, and to the *effect*. About these is our principall enquiry; and to the knowledge of God, which he is said to have of them, is the opposition most expressely made by M. B. Let this then be our conclusion.

§. 23. Concluf. * *Dixit* R. Iuchanan: *omnia videntur ante intuitu. Dixit*

*God * perfectly knowes all the free actions of men, before they are wrought by them; all things that will be done, or shall be to all Eternity, though in their own natures contingent, and wrought by agents free in their working, are known to him from Eternity.*

Rab. Nachman filius Isaaci, sic etiam nos didicimus: quod Scriptum est Psal. 33. v. 15. *formans simul cor eorum, intelligens omnia opera eorum, quomodo intelligendum est? Dicendum est, dici, Deum adunare simul corda totius mundi? Ecce, videmus non ita rem se habere: sed sic dicendum est, Formans sive creator videt simul cor eorum, & intelligit omnia opera eorum.* Talmud. Roich. haschana: interpret: Josephide Voysin.

§. 24. Some previous observations will make way for the cleare proofe and demonstration of this truth. Then

1. God certainly knowes every thing that is to be known: that is, every thing that is *scibile*. If there be in the nature of things an *impossibility* to be known, they cannot be known by the *divine understanding*. If any thing be *scibile*, or may be known, the not knowing of it, is his *imperfection* if he knowes it not. To God this cannot be ascribed, (*viz.* that he should not know what is to be known) without the destruction of his Perfection. He shall not be my God, who is not infinitely Perfect. He who

wants

wants nothing to make him blessed in himselfe, can never make the creation of him selfe the blessednesse of others.

§. 25. 2. Every thing that hath *a determinate cause* is *scibile*, may be known, though future, by him that perfectly knowes that cause, which doth so determine the thing to be known unto existence. Now *Contingent* things, the *free* Actions of men, that yet are not, but in respect of themselves may, or may not be, have such a *determinate cause* of their existence, as that mentioned. It is true, in respect of their *immediate causes*, as the wills of men, they are *contingent*, and may be, or not be; but that they have such a cause as before spoken of, is evident from the light of this consideration. In their own time and order they are: now what ever is at any time, was future; before it was, it was to be. If it had not been future, it had not now been. Its present existence is sufficient demonstration of the futurition it had before. I aske then, whence it came to be *future*; that that action was rather to be, then a thousand others, that were as possible as it? For instance, that the *side of Christ should be pierced with a speare*, when it was as possible in the nature of the thing it selfe, and of all secundary causes, that his head should be cut off. That then which gives any action a *futurition*, is that determinate cause wherein it may be known, whereof we speake. Thus it may be said of the same thing, that it is *contingent*, and *determined*, without the least appearance of contradiction, because it is not spoken with respect to the same things, or causes.

§. 26. 3. The determinate cause of *contingent* things, that is, things that are *future*, (for [a] every thing when it is, and as it is, is necessary) is the Will of [b] God himselfe concerning their Existence and Being, either by his efficiency and working, as all good things in every kind, (that is, that are either Morally or Physically so, in which latter sence, all the actions of men, as actions, are so) or by his permission, which is the condition of things *Morally* evill, or of the irregularity and obliquity attending those actions, upon the account of their relation to a Law, which in themselves are *Entitative* and *Physically*

[a] *Quicquid enim est, dum est, necessario est.* Aquinas 1. part. *Quæst.* 19. Art. 3.

[b] *Vid* Scot. in 1. lib. Sent: dist. 39. quæst. Unica. Durand ibid. *Dist.* 38. *Quæst.* 3. Jo. Major. in 1. Dist. 38, 39. *Quæst:* 1. Art. 4. Aluarez. de Auxiliis. lib. 2. *Disput.* 10. pag. 55. &c. & Scholasticos in Lombardum *ibid.* Dist. 38, 39. *quos fusè enumerat* Joh. Martines de Ripalda in 1. Sent. pag 127. & 131.

cally good, as the things were which God at first created. Whether any thing come to passe, besides the [x] will of God, and contrary to his purpose, will not be disputed with any advantage of Glory to God, or honour to them that shall assert it. That in all events the will of God is fulfilled, is a common notion of all rationall creatures. So the accomplishment of his determinate councell, is affirmed by the Apostle, in the issue of that mysterious dispensation, of the crucifying of his Sonne. That of *Jam.* 4. 15. ἐὰν κύριος θελήσῃ, intimats Gods will to be extended to all actions, as actions, whatever.

[x] *Quid mihi scire quæ futura sunt? quæcunq; ille vult, hæc futura sunt.* Origen. Hom. 6. in Jesum nave. Vid. Frider. Spanhemium Dub. Evang 33. pag. 272. in illud Math. Totum hoc factum est, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου. Paul. Ferrium Schol. Orthodoxi. c. 31. & in Vindiciis. cap. 5. Sect. 6.

Thus God knew, before the world was made, or any thing that is in it, that there would be such a world, and such things in it: yet then the making of the world, nothing was [*] more free or contingent. God is not a necessary Agent, as to any of the workes, that outwardly are of him: whence then did God know this? Was it not from his own decree, and eternall purpose, that such a world there should be? And if the knowledge of one contingent thing be from hence, why not of all? In briefe, these future contingencyes depend on something for their existence, or they come forth into the world in their own strength and upon their own account, not depending on any other. If the latter, they are God; if the former, the will of God, or old fortune, must be the Principle on which they do depend.

[*] Vid. Aquinat. 1. Quæst. 83. Art. 1. ad 3.

§. 27. 4. God can worke with contingent causes, for the accomplishment of his own will, and purposes, without the least prejudice to them, either as causes, or as *free*, and contingent. God moves not, workes not in, or with any second causes, to the producing of any effect, contrary, or not agreeable, to their own natures. Notwithstanding any predetermination, or operation of God, the wills of men in the production of every one of their actions, are at as perfect liberty, as a cause in dependance of another, is capable of. To say it is not independance, is Atheisme. The purpose of God, the councell of his will concerning any thing, as to its existence, gives a [d] necessity

[d] Vid. Didac. Alvarez. de Auxilliis Gratiæ lib. 3. disput. 25. Aquinat. part 2. Quæst. 112. Art. 3. E. 1. Part Quæst. 19. Art. 8. ad. 3.

of

of insallibility to the event, but changes not the manner of the second causes operation, be it what it will. That God cannot accomplish and bring about his own purposes by free and contingent agents, without the destruction of the natures he hath endued them withall, is a figment, unworthy the thoughts of any, who indeed acknowledge his Soveraignty and power.

§. 28. 5. The Reason why M. B's companions in his undertakings, as others that went before him of the same mind, do deny this fore-knowledge of God, they expresse on all occasions to be, that the granting of it is prejudiciall to that absolute independent liberty of will, which God assignes to men; so *Socinus* pleads *Prælect. Theol.* c. 8. y Thus farre I confesse more accurately then the *Arminians*. These pretend (some of them at least) to grant the Prescience of God, but yet deny his determinate Decrees, and purposes on the same pretence that the other do his Prescience, *viz.* Of their Prejudiciallnesse to the free will of man. *Socinus* discourses, (wich was no difficult task) that the *fore-knowledge* of God is as inconsistent with that *independent* liberty of will, and *contingency*, which he, and they had fancyed, as the predetermination of his will; and therefore rejects the former as well as the latter. It was z *Augustines* complaint of old concerning *Cicero*, that *ita fecit homines*

y Crell. de Vera Relig. lib. 1. cap. 24. Smalcius ad: Franz. disput. 12.

z *In has angustias Cicero coarctat animum religiosum, ut unum eligat a duobus: aut esse aliquid in nostra voluntate, aut esse Præscientiam futurorum: quoniam utrumq; arbitratur esse non posse, sed si alterum confirmatur, alterum tolli. Si eligerimus præscientiam futurorum, tolli voluntatis arbitrium. Si eligerimus voluntatis arbitrium, tolli Præscientiam futurorum. Ipse itaq; ut vir magnus & doctus, & vitæ humanæ plurimùm & peritissime consulens, ex his duobus eligit liberum voluntatis arbitrium. Quod ut confirmaretur, negavit præscientiam futurorum, atq; ita dum vult facere liberos, facit sacrilegos. Religiosus autem animus utrumq; eligit, utrumq; confitetur, & fide pietatis utrumq; confirmat. Quomodo inquit: Nam si est Præscientia futurorum, sequantur illa omnia, quæ connexa sunt, donec eo perveniatur, ut nihil sit in nostra voluntate. Porrò, si est aliquid in nostra voluntate, eisdem recursis gradibus eò pervenitur, ut non sit præscientia futurorum. Nam per illa omnia sic recurritur. Si est voluntatis arbitrium, non omnia fato fiunt. Si non omnia fato fiunt, non est omnium certus ordo causarum. Si certus causarum ordo non est: Nec rerum certus est ordo præscienti Deo, quæ fieri non possunt nisi præcedentibus, & efficientibus causis. Si rerum ordo Præscienti Deo certus non est, non omnia sic veniunt, ut ea venitura præscivit. Porro, si non omnia sic eveniunt ut ab illo eventura præscita sunt, non est, inquit in Deo Præscientia futurorum. Nos adversus illos sacrilegos ausus, & impios, & Deum dicimus omnia scire antequam fiant; & voluntate nos facere, quicquid a nobis non nisi volentibus fieri sentimus & novimus.* Augustin. de Civit. Dei lib. 5. cap. 9.

liberos,

liberos, ut fecit etiam sacrilegos. Cicero was a *meere Pagan*; and surely our complaint against any that shall close with him in this attempt, under the name of a *meere Christian*, will not be lesse just then that of *Augustine*. For mine own part, I am fully resolved, that all the liberty and freedome, that as creatures we are capable of, is eminently consistent with Gods absolute decrees, and infallible fore-knowledge. And if I should hesitate in the apprehension thereof, I had rather ten thousand times deny our wills to be free, then God to be omniscient, the soveraigne disposer of all men, their actions, and concernments, or to say that any thing comes to passe, without, against, or contrary to the counsell of his will. But we know through the godnesse of God, that these things have their consistency, and that God may have preserved to him the glory of his infinite Perfection, and the will of man not at all abridged of its due and proper liberty.

§. 29. These things being premised, the proof & demonstration of the truth propos'd lyes ready at hand, in the ensuing particulars;

1. He who *knowes* [a] *all things*, knowes the things that are *future* though contingent. In saying they are *things future* and contingent, you grant them to be among the number of things; as you do those which you call things past: But that *God knowes all things*, hath allready been abundantly confirmed out of Scriptures. Let the Reader looke back on some of the many texts and places, by which I gave answer to the Querie, about the Fore-knowledge of God, and he will find abundantly enough for his satisfaction, if he be of those that would be satisfied, and dares not carelessly make bold to trample upon the Perfections of God. Take some few of them to a review. 1 *John* 3. 20. *God is greater then our hearts, and knoweth all things.* Even we know things past and present: If God knowes only things of the same kind, his knowledge may be greater then ours by *many degrees*, but you cannot say his understanding is infinite; there is not on that supposition an *infinite* distance between his knowledge and ours, but they stand in some measurable proportion. *Heb.* 4. 13. *All things are open and naked before him with whom we have to do.* Not that which is to *come*, not the *free actions* of men that are future, saith M. *Biddle*. But to distinguish thus, when the Scripture doth not distinguish, and tha

[a] *Causam quare Deus futura contingentia præsciat damus hanc, quod sit infinita ipsius intellectus perfectio omnia cognoscentis. Et sicut Deus cognoscit præterita secundum esse quod habuerunt, ita etiam cognoscit futura secundum illud esse quod habitura sunt.* Dan. Clasen. Theol. Natural. cap. 22. pag. 128.

that to the great dishonour of God, is not to interpret the Word, but to deny it. *Acts* 15.18. *Known unto God are all his workes from the foundation of the world.* I aske, whether God hath any thing to do in the free actions of men? For instance, had he any thing to do in the sending of *Joseph* into *Egypt*, his exaltation there, and the entertainment of his Fathers household afterwards by him in his greatnesse and power? All which were brought about by innumerable contingencyes, and free actions of men: If he had not, why should we any longer depend on him, or regard him in the severall transactions, & concernements of our lives?

Nullum numen abest, si sit prudentia; nos te,
Nos facimus fortuna Deum.

If he had to do with it, as *Joseph* thought he had, when he affirmed plainely, *that God sent him thither, and made him a Father to Pharaoh, and his house*, then the whole was known to God before; for *known unto God are all his workes from the foundation of the world.* And if God may know any one free action before hand, he may know all; for there is the same reason of them all. Their contingency is given as the only cause, why they may not be known; now every action that is contingent, is equally interested therein: *a quatenus ad omne valet argumentum.* That place of the *Psalme* before recited *Psal.* 139. 2,3,4,5,6. is expresse, as to the knowledge of God concerning our free actions, that are yet future. If any thing in the world may be reckoned amongst our free actions, surely our *thoughts* may: and such a close reserved treasure are they, that M.B. doth more then insinuate in the application of the texts of Scripture, which he mentioneth, that God knoweth them not when present, without search and inquiry. But these (saith the Psalmist,) *God knowes afarre off*, before we think them; before they enter into our hearts. And truly I marvell, that any man, not wholly given up to a *spirit of giddinesse*, after he had produced this Text of Scripture, to prove that God knowes our thoughts, should instantly subjoyne a Question, leading men to a perswasion, that God knowes not our free actions, that are future: unlesse it was with a *Julian* designe, to impaire the credit of the Word of God, by pretending it lyable to selfe-contradiction; or with *Lucian* to deride God, as bearing contrary Testimonies concerning himselfe. Gen. 45.5,6, 7,8.

2.

§. 30. 2. God hath by himselfe and his Holy [b] Prophets, which have been from the foundation of the world, fore-told many of the free actions of men, what they would do, what they should doe, long before they were borne who were to do them. To give a little light to this Argument, which of it selfe will easily overwhelme all that stands before it, I shall handle it under these propositions.

[b] *Præscientia Dei tot habet Testes, quot fecit Prophetas:* Tertull. l. 2. contra Marcionem.

1. That God hath so fore-told the free actions of men.

2. That so he could not do unless he knew them, and that they would be, then when he foretold them.

3. That he proves himselfe to be God by these his predictions.

4. That he foretells them as the meanes of executing many of his Judgements, which he hath purposed and threatned, and the accomplishment of many mercyes, which he hath promised; so that the denyall of his foresight of them, so exempts them from under his Providence, as to inferre, that he rules not in the world by punishments and rewards.

For the first.

§. 31. 1. There need no great search or inquiry after witnesses to confirme the truth of it; the Scripture is full of such predictions from one end to the other: some few instances shall suffice: *Gen.* 18. 18, 19. *Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty Nation, and all the Nations of the earth shall be blessed in him; For I know him, that he will command his Children, and his houshold after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do Justice and Judgment; that the Lord may bring upon upon Abraham, that which he hath spoken of him.* Scarce a word but is expressive of some future contingent thing, if the free actions of men be so, before they are wrought. That *Abraham* should become a *mighty nation*: that the nations of the Earth should be *Blessed in him*: that he would command his Children, and houshold after him to keepe the wayes of the Lord; it was all to be brought about by the free actions of *Abraham*, and of others; and all this I know saith the Lord, and accordingly declares it. By the way, if the Lord knew all this before, his following tryall of *Abraham* was not to satisfy himselfe whether he feared him or no, as is pretended.

So

So also *Gen.* 15. 13,14. *And he said unto Abraham, know of a surely that thy seed shall be a stranger in a Land that is not theirs, and they shall serve them, and they shall afflict them foure hundred yeares: And also that Nation which they shall serve will I Judge: and they shall come out with great substance.* The *Ægyptians* affliction on the *Israelites* was by their free actions, if any be free: It was their sin to do it: they sinned in all that they did for the effecting of it. And doubtlesse if any, mens sinfull actions are free; yet these doth God here fore tell; they shall afflict them. §. 32.

Deut. 31. 16,17,18. you have an instance beyond all possible exception. *And the Lord said unto Moses, behold thou shalt sleepe with thy Fathers, & this People will rise up, and go a whoring after the Gods of the strangers of the land, whither they go to be amongst them, and will forsake me, and breake my commandements. Then my anger shall be kindled against them in that day, and I will forsake them, and I will hide my face from them, and they shall be devoured, and many evills and troubles shall befall them, so that they will say in that day, are not these evills come upon us, because our God is not amongst us? &c.* The summe of a good part of what is recorded in the book of *Judges*, is here foretold by God. The peoples going a *whoring* after the Gods of the strangers of the Land; their forsaking of God, their breaking his Covenant, the thoughts of their hearts, & their expressions, upon the consideration of the evills and afflictions that should befall them, were of their free actions: but now all these doth God here *foretell*; and thereby engages the honour of his Truth, unto the certainty of their comming to passe. §. 33.

1 *Kings* 13. 2. is signall to the same purpose: *Behold a child shall be borne unto the house of David, Josiah by name, and upon thee shall he offer the Priests of the High places, that burne incense upon thee, and mens bones shall be burnt on thee.* This prediction is given out 300 yeares before the birth of *Josiah*. The accomplishment of it you have in the story 2 *Kings* 23. 17. Did *Josiah* act freely? Was his proceeding at *Bethel* by free actions, or no? If not, how shall we know what actions of men are free, what not? If it was, his free actions are here foretold, and therefore (I think) fore seen. §. 34.

1 *Kings* 22. 28. The Prophet *Micaiah* in the name of the Lord, having fore told a thing that wa contingent, and which was accomplished by a man acting at a §. 35.

venture, lays the credit of his Propheſy, and therein his life, (For if he had proved falſe as to the event, he was to have ſuffered death by the Law,) at ſtake before all the people, upon the certainty of the Iſſue fore-told. *And Micaiah ſaid, if thou returne at all in peace, the Lord hath not ſpoken at all by me. And he ſaid, heare all yee people.*

Of theſe predictions the Scripture is full. The Propheſyes of *Cyrus* in *Iſaiah*; of the iſſue of the *Babyloniſh Warre*, and *Kingdome*, in *Jeremiah*; of the ſeverall great alterations and changes in the Empires of the world, in *Daniel*; of the Kingdome of Chriſt in them all, are too long to be inſiſted on. The Reader may alſo conſult *Math.* 24. 5. *Mark*, 13. 6. *Mark*, 14. 30. *Act.* 20. 29. 2 *Theſ.* 2. 3, 4. &c. 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. 2 *Tim.* 3. 1. 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. And the *Revelation* almoſt throughout. Our firſt propoſition then is undenyably evident, that God by *himſelfe*, and by his *Prophets*, hath fore-told things *future*, even the free-actions of men.

§. 36. 2. The ſecond Propoſition mentioned is manifeſt, and evident in its own Light. What God fore-telleth, that he perfectly fore-knowes. The honour and repute of his Veracity, and Truth, yea of his Being, depend on the certaine accompliſhment of what he abſolutely fore-tells. If his predictions of things future are not bottomed on his certaine Preſcience of them, they are all but like *Sathans Oracles*, conjectures, and gueſſes of what may be accompliſhed or not; a ſuppoſition whereof, is as high a pitch of blaſphemy as any creature in this world can poſſibly arrive unto.

§. 37. 3. By this Prerogative of certaine predictions, in reference to things to come, God vindicates his own Deity; and from the want of it convinces the vanity of the Idols of the *Gentiles*, and the falſeneſſe of the Prophets that pretend to ſpeake in his name. *Iſa.* 41. 21, 22, 23, 24. *Produce your cauſe, ſaith the Lord, bring forth your ſtrong Reaſons, ſaith the King of Jacob: let them bring them forth, and ſhew us what ſhall happen, let them ſhew the former things what they be, or delare us things for to come: Shew the things which are to come hereafter, that we may know ye are Gods. Behold you are of nothing.* The Lord calling forth the Idols of the *Gentiles*, Divels, Stocks, and Stones, to plead for themſelves, before the denuntiation of the ſolemne ſentence enſuing, *v.* 24. He puts them to the plea of *fore-knowledge* for the proofe of their Deity. If they can fore-tell

fore-tell things to come certainely and infallibly, on the account of their own knowledge of them, Gods they are, and Gods they shall be esteemed. If not (saith he) you *are nothing, worse then nothing*, and your worke is of nought, and he is an *Abomination that chuseth you*. And it may particularly be remarked, that the Idolls, of whom he speaketh, are in especiall those of the *Caldeans*, whose worshippers pretended above all men in the world to Divination, and Predictions. Now this issue doth the Lord drive things to betwixt himselfe, and the Idolls of the world; If they can fore-tell things to come, that is, not this, or that thing, (for so by conjecture, upon consideration of second causes, and the generall dispositions of things, they may do, and the Divell hath done) but any thing, or every thing, they shall go free, that is, is there nothing hid from you that is yet for to be? Being not able to stand before this interrogation, they perish before the Judgment mentioned. But now if it may be replyed to the *Living God* himself, that this is a most unequall way of proceeding, to lay that burthen upon the shoulders of others, which himselfe will not beare; bring others to that tryall, which himselfe cannot undergoe, for he himselfe cannot fore-tell the free-actions of men, because he doth not foreknow them, would not his plea render him like to the Idolls, whom he adjudgeth to shame and confusion? God himselfe there concluding, that they are vanity and nothing, who are pretended to be Gods, but are not able to fore-tell the things that are for to come, asserts his own Deity, upon the account of his Infinite Understanding, and Knowledge of all things, on the account whereof he can foreshew all things whatever, that are as yet future. In like manner doth he proceed to evince what is from himselfe, what not, in the Predictions of any, from the certainty of the event. *Deut.* 18. 21, 22. *If thou say in thine heart, how shall we know the word that the Lord hath not spoken, when a Prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to passe, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the Prophet hath spoken presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him.*

4. The fourth Proposition, that God by the free actions of men (some whereof he fore telleth,) doth fullfill his own counsell as to Judgements, and Mercyes, Rewards, and Punish- §. 38.

ments, needs no farther proofe nor confirmation, but what will arise from a meere review of the things before mentioned, by God so foretold, as was to be proved. They were things of the greatest import in the World, as to the good or evill of the inhabitants thereof; & in whose accomplishment as much of the Wisdome, Power, Righteousnesse, and Mercy of God was manifest, as in any of the workes of his Providence what ever. Those things which he hath disposed of, as to be subservient to so great ends, certainly he knew that they would be. The selling of *Ioseph*, the crucyfying of his Son, the destruction of *Antichrist*, are things of greater concernment, then that God should only conjecture at their event. And indeed the taking away of Gods *fore-knowledge* of things contingent, renders his Providence useless, as to the goverment of the World. To what end should any *rely* upon him, seek unto him, commit themselves to his care through the course of their lives, when he knows not what will, or may befall them the next day? How shall he Judg, or rule the world, who every moment is surprized with new emergencyes, which he foresaw not, which must necessitate him to new counsells and determinations? On the consideration of this Argument doth *Episcopius* conclude for the Prescience of God, *Epist. 2. ad Beverovicium de termino vitæ*, which he had allowed to be questioned in his [c] private *Theologicall Disputations*, [d] though in his publike afterwards he plead for it. The summe of the Argument insisted on, amounts to this,

[c] *Speciem & pondus videtur habere hæc objectio; nec pauci sunt, qui ejus vi adeo moventur, ut divinam futurorum contingentium præscientiam negare, & quæ pro eâ facere videntur loca, atq; Argumenta, magno conatu torquere malint, & flectere in sensus, non minus periculosos quam difficiles. Ad me quod attinet, Ego hactenus sive Religione quadam animi, sive divinæ Majestatis reverentia, non potui prorsus in animum meum inducere, rationem istam allegatam tanti esse, ut propter eam Deo futurorum contingentium præscientia detrahenda sit: maxime cum vix videam, quomodo alioquin divinarum prædictionum veritas salvari possit, sine aliqua aut incertitudinis macula, aut falsi possibilis suspicione: Sim: Episcop.* Respond. ad secund. *Epist.* Johan: Beverovi. [d] *Episcop.* institut: Theol: lib. 4. cap. 17, 18. *Episcop:* disput. de Deo Thes: 10.

Those things which God foretells, that they shall certainly and infallibly come to passe, before they so doe, those he certainly and infallibly knoweth, whilest they are future, and that they will come to passe.

But

But God foretells, and hath foretold all manner of future contingencies, and free Actions of men, good and evill, duties, and sinnes, therefore he certainly and infallibly knowes them, whilest they are yet future.

The Proposition stands and falls unto the honour of Gods Truth, Veracity, and Power.

The Assumption is proved by the former, and sundry other instances that may be given.

He foretold, that the *Ægyptians* should afflict his People 400 yeares, that in so doing they would sin, and that for it he would punish them, *Gen.*15.13,14,15,16. And surely the *Ægyptians* sinning therein, was their own free action. The incredulity of the *Jewes*, treachery of *Judas*, calling of the *Gentiles*, all that happened to Christ in the daies of his flesh, the coming of Antichrist, the rise of false teachers, were all fore-told, and did all of them purely depend on the free actions of men: which was to be demonstrated.

3. To omit many other Arguments, and to close this discourse; All perfections are to be ascribed to God, they are all in him. To *know* is an excellency; He that knowes any thing, is therein better then he that knowes it not. The more any one knowes, the more excellent is he. To *know all things* is an absolute perfection in the good of knowledge: to know them in, and by himselfe, who so knowes them, & not from any discourses, made to him from without, is an absolute perfection in it selfe, and is required where there is Infinite Wisdome and Understanding. This we ascribe to God, as worthy of him, as by himselfe ascribed to himselfe. To affirme on the other side (1.) That God hath his knowledge from things without him, and so is taught Wisdome and Understanding, as we are, from the events of things, for the more any one knowes the wiser he is. (2.) That he hath (as we have) a successive knowledge of things, knowing that one day, which he knew not another, and that thereupon there is (3.) A daily and hourely change, and alteration in him, as from the increasing of his knowledge there must actually and formally be; and that he (4.) sits conjecturing at events; To assert I say, these and the like monstrous figments, concerning God, and his Knowledge, is as much as in them lyeth, who so § 39.

assert

them, to shut his Providence out of the World, and to devest him of all his Blessednesse, selfe-sufficiency, and infinite Perfections. And indeed if M. B. believe his own principles, and would speake out, he must assert these things, how desperate soever; for having granted the premises, 'tis stupidity to stick at the conclusion. And therefore some of those whom M. B. is pleased to follow in these wild vagaries, speake out, and say, (though with as much blasphemy as confidence) that God doth only conjecture, and guesse at future contingents. For when this Argument is brought, *Gen.* 18. 19. *I know* (saith God) *Abraham will command his Children after him, &c.* Therefore future contingents may be certainly known of him. They deny the consequence, and granting that he may be said to know them, yet say 'tis only by guesse, and conjecture, as we do. And for the present vindication of the Attributes of God this may suffice.

[a] Anonymus ad 5. cap. priora Math. p. 28. *Nego consequentiam Deus dicere potuit se scire quid factuus erat Abraham, etsi id certo non prænoverit, sed probabiliter. Inducitur enim Deus sæpius humano more loquens: Solent autem homines affirmare se scire ea futura, quæ verisimiliter futura sunt &c.*

§. 44. Before I close this discourse, it may not be impertinent to divert a little to that, which alone seemes to be of any difficulty, lying in our way, in the assertion of this Prescience of God, though no occasion of its consideration be administred to us by him, with whom we have to do.

That future contingents have not in themselves a determinate truth, and therefore cannot be determinately known, is the great plea of those, who oppose Gods certaine Fore-knowledge of them: and therefore say they, doth the [e] Philosopher affirme, that propositions concerning them, are neither true nor false. But

[e] Arist. l. 1. de Interp. c. 8.

1. That there is, or may be, that there hath been, a certaine prediction of *future contingents*, hath been demonstrated, and therefore they must on some account or other, (and what that account is hath been declared) have a determinate Truth. And I had much rather conclude, that there are certaine *predictions* of *future contingents* in the Scripture, and therefore they have a determinate truth: Then on the contrary, they have no determinate Truth, therefore there are no certaine predictions of them: *Let God be true, and every man a lyer.*

2

2. As to the falsity of that pretended *Axiom*: This proposition, Such a Souldier shall pierce the side of Christ, with a Speare, or he shall not pierce him, is determinately true, and necessary, on the one side or the other, the parts of it being contradictory, which cannot be together. Therefore if a man before the Flood had used this Proposition in the affirmative, it had been certainely and determinately true; for that Proposition, which was once not true, cannot be true afterward upon the same account.

3. If no affirmative [f] Proposition, about future contingents, be determinately true, then every such affirmative propositi n is determinately false; for from hence, that a thing is, or is not, is a proposition determinately true or false. And therefore if any one shall say, that that is determinately future, which is absolutely indifferent, his affirmation is false; which is contrary to *Aristotle*, whom in this they rely upon, who affirmes, that such Propositions are neither true nor false. The Truth is, of propositions that they are true or false, is certaine. Truth, or Falsenes, are their proper & necessary affections, as even and odde of numbers: nor can any proposition be given, wherein there is a contradiction, whereof one part is not true, and the other false.

[f] Alphons. de Mendoza. Con. Theol. Scholast. q. 1. pag. 534. Vasquez. in 1. Tho. disput. 16. Ruvio in 1. Interpret. cap. 6. q. unica &c.

4. This Proposition, *Petrus orat*, is determinately true *de presenti*, when *Peter* doth actually pray: (for *quicquid est, dum est, determinatè est*) therefore this proposition *de futuro*, *Petrus orabit*, is determinately true. The former is the measure and rule, by which we judge of the latter. So that because 'tis true *de presenti*, *Petrus orat*, *Ergo*, This (*de futuro*) *Petrus orabit*, was *ab æterno* true (*ex parte rei*) and then (*ex parte modi*) because this Proposition *Petrus orat*, is determinately true *de presenti*: *Ergo*, This *Petrus orabit*, was determinately true from all eternity. But enough of this.

Vid. Rod. de Arriaga. disput. Log. 14. Sect. 5. subsect. 3 p. 205. Suarez. in Opus l. 1. de Præscientia Dei cap. 2. Vasquez. 1. Part. disp. 66. cap. 2. Pet. Hurtado de Mend. disp. 9. de Anima. Sect. 6.

M. B. having made a sad complaint of the ignorance and darkenesse that men were bred up in, by being led from the Scripture, and imposing himselfe upon them for *a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkenes, an instructer of the foolish, and a teacher of the babes*, doth in persuit of his great undertakinge, in this Chapter instruct them, what the Scripture speakes concerning the Being, Nature, and Propertyes of God. Of his Goodnesse, Wisdome, Power, Truth, Righteousnesse, Faithfullnesse,

fullnesse, Mercy, Independency, Soveraignty, Infiniteneſſe, men had before been informed, by Bookes, Tracts, and Catechiſmes, compoſed according to the fancyes and intereſts of men, the Scripture being utterly juſtled out of the way: Alas of theſe things the Scriptures ſpeakes not at all: but the deſcription wherein that abounds of God, and which is neceſſary that men ſhould know, (whatever become of thoſe other inconſiderable things, wherewith other poore Catechiſmes are ſtuffed) is, that he is finite, limited, and obnoxious to Paſſions, &c. *Thou that abhorreſt Idolls, doſt thou commit Sacriledge.*

CAP. VI.

Of the Creation, and Condition of man before, and after the fall.

Mr BIDDLE'S 3d Chapter.

§. 1. Qu. WHen *the Heaven and Earth from all eternity, or created at a certain time? And by whom?*

A. Gen. 1. 1.

Q. *How long was God a making them?*

A. Exod. 20. 11.

Q. *How did God create man?*

A. Gen. 2. 7

Q. *How did he create Woman?*

A. Gen. 2. 21, 22.

Q. *Why was ſhe called* Woman?

A. Gen. 2. 23.

Q. *What doth Moſes inferre from her being made a woman, and brought unto the man?*

A. Gen. 2. 24.

Q. *Where did God put man, after he was created?*

A. Gen. 2. 8.

Q. *What commandment gave he to the man, when he put him into the Garden?*

A. Gen. 2. 16, 17.

Q. *Was the man deceived to eat of the forbidden fruit?*

A. 1 Tim. 2. 14.

Q. *By whom was the woman deceived?*

A. 2 Cor. 11. 3.

Q. *How was the Woman induced to eat of the forbidden fruit? And how the Man?*

A. Gen. 3. 6.

Q.

Q. What effect followed upon their eating?

A. Gen. 3. 7.

Q. Did the sinne of our First Parents in eating of the forbidden fruit, bring both upon them, and their posterity, the guilt of Hell-fire, deface the Image of God in them, darken their understanding, enslave their will, deprive them of power to do good, and cause mortality? If not, what are the true penalties that God denounced against them for the said offence?

A. Gen. 3. 16, 17, 18, 19.

EXAMINATION.

§. 1. HAving delivered his thoughts concerning God Himselfe, His Nature, and Propertyes, in the foregoing Chapters; in this our Catechist proceeds to the consideration of his *Workes*, ascribing to God the *Creation* of all things, especially insisting on the making of man. Now although many questions might be proposed, from which M. B. would (I suppose) be scarcely able to extricate himselfe, relating to the impossibility of the proceeding of such a *Worke*, as the Creation of all things, from such an *Agent* as he hath described God to be, so *limited* both in his Essence and Propertyes; Yet, it being no part of my business, to dispute, or perplexe any thing, that is simply in its selfe true, and unquestionable, with the attendencyes of it from other corrupt notions of him, or them, by whom it is received, and proposed, I shall wholly omit all considerations of that nature, and apply my selfe meerly to what is by him expressed. That He who is *limited* & *finite in Essence*, and consequently in *Properties*, should by his power, without the helpe of any intervening instrument, out of nothing produce, at such a vast distance from him, as his hands can by no meanes reach unto, such mighty effects, as the earth it selfe, and the fulnesse thereof, is not of an easy proofe or resolution. But on these things at present I shall not insist: Certaine it is, that on this apprehension of God, the [a] *Epicureans* disputed for the impossibility of the Creation of the world.

[a] *Quibus enim oculis intueri potuerit vester Plato fabricam illam tanti operis, quâ construi a Deo & ædificari mundum facit? Quæ molitio? Quæ ferramenta? Qui vectes? Quæ machinæ? Qui ministri tanti muneris fuerunt? Quemadmodum autem obediens parere voluntati architecti ars, aqua, terra, potuerunt?* Velleius apud Ciceron. de Natu. Deor. lib. 1. sparim a principio.

§. 2. His first question then is,

Were the Heavens and Earth from all eternity, or Created at a certaine time? And by whom?

To which he answers with *Gen.* 1.1. *In the Beginning God created Heaven and Earth.*

Right! only in the Exposition of this verse, as it discovers the principall efficient cause of the Creation of all things, or the Author of this great worke, M. B. afterwards expounds himselfe to differ from us, and the *Word of God*, in other places. By (*God*) he intends the *Father* only, and exclusively; the Scripture plentifully ascribing this Worke also to the *Sonne*, and Holy Ghost, manifesting their concurrence in the indivisible Deity unto this great worke; though by the way of *Eminency*, this worke be attributed to the Father, as that of Redemption is to the Sonne, and that of Regeneration to the Holy Ghost; from neither of which notwithstanding is the Father excluded.

§. 3. Perhaps [b] the using of the name of *God* in the *plurall number*, where mention is made of the Creation, in conjunction with a *Verb singular*, *Gen.* 1.1. and the expresse calling of God our *Creators and Makers*, *Eccles.* 12.1. *Psal.* 149. 2. *Job.* 35.10. wants not a significancy to this thing. And indeed, he that shall consider the miserable evasions, that the [c] Adversaries have invented, to escape the Argument thence commonly insisted on, must needs be confirmed in the perswasion of the force of it. M. *Biddle* may hapily close with *Plato* in this businesse; Who in his *Timæus* brings in his Δημιεργὸς, speaking to his *Genii* about the making of man; telling them that they were mortall, but incouraging them to obey him, in the making of other creatures upon the promise of immortallity. [d] *Turne you* (saith he) *according to the Law of nature to the making of living Creatures, and imitate my power, which I used in your Generation, or birth.* A speech fit enough

[b] *Poterat & illud de Angelis intelligi, faciamus hominem &c. sed quia sequitur, ad imaginem nostram, nefas est credere, ad imagines Angelorum hominem esse factum, aut eandem esse imaginem Angelorum & Dei. Et ideo rectè intelligitur pluralitas Trinitatis. Quæ tamen Trinitas, quia unus est Deus, etiam cum dixisset, faciamus, & fecit, inquit, Deus hominem ad imaginem Dei: non vero dixit, fecerunt Dii ad imaginem Deorum.* Augustin. de Civit. Dei. lib. 16. cap. 6.

[c] Georg. Eniedin. Explicat. loc. Ver. & Nov. Testam. in Gen. 1.26.

[d] Τρέπεσθε κατὰ φύσιν ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ζώων δημιουργίαν, μιμούμενοι τὴν ἐμὴν δύναμιν περὶ τὴν ὑμῶν γένεσιν. *Plato. in Timæo.*

enough for M. B's God, *who is fast up in Heaven*, and not able of himselfe to attend his whole businesse. But what a sad successe this *Demiurgus* had, by his want of *Prescience*, or fore-sight of what his *Daemons* would do, (wherein also M. *Biddle* likens God unto him) is farther declared: for they imprudently, causing a conflux of too much *matter and humour*, no small tumult followed thereon in Heaven, as at large you may see in the same Author. However, it is said expressly the *Son* or *Word created all things*, *John* 1.3. *and by him are all things*, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *Revel.* 4. 11. Of the Holy Ghost the same is affirmed, *Gen.* 1. 2. *Job.* 26. 13. *Psal.* 33, 6. Nor can the Word and Spirit be degraded from the place of Principall efficient cause in this Worke, to a condition of *instrumentallity* only, which is urged, (especially in reference to the Spirit) unlesse we shall suppose them to have been created before any creation, and to have been instrumentall of their own production. But of these things in their proper place.

§. 4. Q. His second question is, *How long was God a making them?* And he answers from *Exod.* 20. 11. *In six dayes the Lord made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all that is in them.*

The rule formerly I prescribed to my selfe of dealing with M. B. causes me to passe this Question also, without farther inquiry; although having already considered what his notions are, concerning the Nature and Propertyes of God, I can scarse avoid conjecturing, that by this crude proposall of the *Time*, wherein the worke of Gods Creation was finished, there is an intendment, to insinuate such a grosse conception of the working of God, as will by no meanes be suited to his omnipotent production of all things. But speaking of things no farther then enforced, I shall not insist on this Query.

§. 5. Q. His third is, *How did God Create man?* And the Answer is, *Gen.* 2 7. To which he adds a fourth, *How did He Create Woman?* which he resolves from *Gen.* 2. 21, 22.

M. *Biddle* undertaking to give all *the grounds of Religion* in his *Catechismes*, teacheth as well by his *silence* as his *expressions*. What he mentions not in the known Doctrine he opposeth, he may well be interpreted to reject. As to the matter *whereof Man* and *Woman* were made, M. *Biddles* Answers do expresse it; but as to,

the condition and ſtate, *wherein* they were made, of that he is ſilent; though he knowes the Scripture doth much more abound in delivering the one then the other. Neither can his ſilence in this thing be imputed to overſight, or forgetfullneſſe, conſidering how ſubſervient it is to his intendment, in his two laſt queſtions, for the ſubverting of the Doctrine of *Originel ſinne*, and the denyall of all thoſe effects, and conſequents of the firſt breach of Covenant, whereof he ſpeakes. He can upon another account take notice, that man was made in the *Image of God*. But whereas hitherto Chriſtians have ſuppoſed, that that denoted ſome *Spirituall perfection* beſtowed on man, wherein he reſembles God, M. B. hath diſcovered, that it is only an expreſſion of ſome *imperfection of God*, wherein he reſembles man: which yet he will as hardly perſwade us of, as that a man hath *ſeven eyes*, or *two wings*, which are aſcribed unto God alſo. That man was created in a reſemblance and likeneſſe unGod, in that immortall ſubſtance *breathed* into his noſtrills, *Gen.* 2.7. in the excellent rationall faculties thereof; the dominion he was intruſted withall over a great part of Gods Creation, but eſpecially in the integrity and *uprightneſſe* of his perſon, *Eccl.* 7.29. wherein he ſtood before God, in reference to the obedience required at his hands; which condition, by the implanting of new *qualities* in our ſoule, we are through Chriſt in ſome meaſure *renewed* unto, *Coll.* 3.10,12. *Eph.* 4.24. the Scripture is cleare, evident, and full in the diſcovery of; but hereof M. B. conceives not himſelfe bound to take notice. But what is farther needfull to be ſpoken, as to the ſtate of man before the Fall, will fall under the conſideration of the laſt Queſtion of this Chapter.

§. 6. M. B's proces in the following queſtions, is to expres the ſtory of mans outward condition, unto the eighth, where he enquires after the Commandement given of God to man, when he put him into the Garden, in theſe words.

Q. *What commandement gave he to the man, when he put him into the Garden?* This he reſolves from *Gen.* 2. 16,17. That God gave our firſt Parents the command expreſſed, is undeniable. That the matter chiefely expreſſed in that command, was all, or the principall part of what he required of them, M. B. doth not go about to prove. I ſhall only deſire to know of him, whether God

God did not in that estate require of them, that they should *love him, feare him, believe him, acknowledge* their dependance on him, in universall obedience to his will? And whether a suitablenesse unto all this duty, were not wrought within them by God? If he shall say no, and that God required no more of them but only *not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evill*; I desire to know, whether they might have *hated* God, *abhorred* him, *believed* Sathan, and yet been free from the threatning here mentioned, if they had only forbore the outward eating of the fruit? If this shall be granted, I hope I need not insist to manifest what will easily be inferred? Nor to shew how impossible this is, [e] God continuing God, and man a rationall creature? If he shall say, that certainly God did require, that they should *own* him for God, that is, *believe* him, *love* him, *feare* him, and worship him, according to all that he should reveale to them, and require of them, I desire to know, whether this particular command, could be any other then *Sacramentall*, and *Symbolicall*, as to the matter of it, being a thing of so small importance in its own nature, in comparison of those morall acknowledgements of God before mentioned. And to that question I shall not need to adde more.

[e] *vid.* Diatrib. de Justit. Vindicat.

§. 7. Although it may justly be supposed, that M. B. is not without some thoughts of deviation from the truth, in the following Questions, yet the last being of most importance, and he being expres therein, in denying all the effects of the first sinne, but only the Curse that came upon the outward visible World, I shall insist only on that, and close our considerations of this Chapter. His question is thus proposed.

§. 8. Q. *Did the sinne of our first Parents in eating of the forbidden fruit, bring both upon them, and their posterity, the guilt of hell fire, deface the Image of God in them, darken their understandings, enslave their wills, deprive them of Power to do good, and cause mortality? If not, what are the true penalties denounced against them for that offence.*

To this he answers from *Gen.* 3. 16, 17, 18, 19.

§. 9. What the sinne of our first Parents was, may easily be discovered from what was said before, concerning the commandement given to them. If universall obedience was required of them unto God, according to the tenour of the law of their Creation,

Creation, their sinne was an universall Rebellion against, and Apostacy from him; which though it expressed it selfe, in the peculiar transgression of that command mentioned; yet it is farre from being reducible to any one kind of sinne, whose whole nature is comprised in that expression. Of the effects of this sinne, commonly assigned, M. B. annumerates, and rejects *Six*: sundry whereof are coincident, and all but one, reducible to that generall head of losse of the image of God. But for the exclusion of them all at once from being any effects of the first sinne, M. *Biddle* thus argues; *If there were no effects, nor consequences of the first sinne, but what are expressly mentioned Gen. 3. 16, 17. &c. then those now mentioned are no effects of it; but there are no effects, or consequences of that first sinne, but what are mentioned in that place; therefore those recounted in his Querie, and commonly esteemed such, are to be cashired from any such place in the thoughts of men.*

Ans. The words insisted on by M. *Biddle*, being expressive of the Curse of God for sinne, on man, and the whole creation here below for his sake, it will not be easy for him to evince, that none of the things he rejects, are not eminently enwrapped in them. Would God have denounced, and actually inflicted such a Curse on the whole Creation, which he had put in subjection to man, as well as upon man himselfe, and actually have inflicted it with so much dread, and severity, as he hath done, if the Transgression upon the account whereof he did it, had not been as universall a rebellion against him, as could be fallen into? Man fell in his whole dependance from God, and is cursed universally in all his concernments, Spirituall and Temporall.

§. 10. But is this indeed the *only* place of Scripture, where the effects of our Apostacy from God, in the sinne of our first Parents, are described? M. *Biddle* may as well tell us, that *Gen.* 3. 15. is the only place, where mention is made of Jesus Christ; for there he is mentioned. But a little to cleare this whole matter in our passage, though what hath been spoken may suffice, to make naked M. B's Sophistry.

§. 11. 1. By the effects of the first sinne, we understand every thing of evill, that either within, or without, in respect of a present, or future condition, in reference to God, and the fruition of Him

Him, whereto man was created, or the enjoyment of any goodness from God, which is come upon mankind, by the just ordination & appointment of God, whereunto man was not obnoxious in his *Primitive* state and condition. I am not at present at all engaged to speak *de modo*, of what is *privative*, what *positive* in originall sinne, of the way of the Traduction, or propagation of it, of the imputation of the guilt of the first sinne, and adhesion of the pollution of our nature, defiled thereby, or any other questions, that are coincident with these, in the usuall *inquest* made into, and after the sinne of *Adam*, and the fruits of it, but only as to the things themselves, which are here wholly denyed. Now

2. That what soever is evill in man by nature, whatever he is obnoxious and lyable unto, that is hurtfull, and destructive to him, and all men in common, in reference to the end whereto they were created, or any Title wherewith they were at first intrusted, is all wholly the effect of the first sinne, and is *in solidum* to be ascribed thereunto, is easily demonstrated. For §. 12.

1. That which is common to all things in any kind, and is proper to them only of that kind, must needs have some common cause equally respecting the whole kind: but now of the evills that are common to all mankind, and peculiar, or proper to them, and every one of them, there can be no cause, but that which equally concernes them all, which by the Testimony of God himselfe, was this fall of *Adam*, *Rom.* 5. 15, 18. §. 13.

2. The evills that are now incumbent upon men in their Naturall condition, (which what they are, shall be afterward considered) were either incumbent on them at their first creation, before the sinne and fall of our first Parents, or they are come upon them since, through some interposing cause, or occasion. That they were not in them, on them, that they were not liable, nor obnoxious to those evills, which are now incumbent on them, in their first Creation, as they came forth from the hand of God, (besides what was said before, of the state and condition wherein man was Created, even upright in the sight of God, in his favour and Aceptation, no way obnoxious to his anger and wrath,) is evident, by the light of §. 14.

this

this one consideration, *viz.* That there was nothing in man, nor belonging to him, no Respect, no Regard, or Relation, but what was purely, and immediately of the holy Gods creation, and institution. Now it is contrary to all that he hath revealed, or made known to us of himselfe, that he should be the immediate Author of so much evill, as is now by his own Testimony in man by nature, and without any Occasion, of so much vanity, and misery as he is subject unto: and besides, directly thwarting the Testimony which he gave of all the Workes of his hands, that they *were exceeding good*: it being evident, that man in the condition whereof we speake, is exceeding evill.

§. 15. 3. If all the evill mentioned, hath since befallen mankind, then it hath done so by some chance and Accident, whereof God was not aware, or by his righteous Judgment and Appointment, in reference to some procuring, and justly deserving Cause of such a punishment. To affirme the first, is upon the matter to deny him to be God: And I doubt not, but that men, at as easy and cheape a rate of sinne, may deny that there is a God, as confessing his Divine Essence, to turne it into an Idol; and by *making thick clouds*, as *Job* speakes, to interpose between him & the affaires of the World, to exclude his Energeticall Providence in the dispossall of all the workes of his hands. If the latter be affirmed, I aske as before, what other common cause, wherein all and every one of mankind is equally concerned, can be assigned of the evills mentioned, as the procurement of the Wrath and Vengeance of God, from whence they are, but only the fall of *Adam*, the sinne of our first Parents; especially considering, that the Holy Ghost doth so expressly point out this fountain, and sourse of the evills insisted on, *Rom.* 5.

Rom. 1. 18.

§. 16. 4. These things then being premised, it will quickly appeare, that every one of the particulars, rejected by M. B. from being fruits or effects of the first sinne, are indeed the proper issues of it: and though M. B. cut the *Roll* of the Abominations, and corruptions of the Nature of man by sinne, *and cast it into the fire*, yet we may easily *write* it againe, and *adde many more Words* of the like importance.

§. 17. 1. The first Effect or fruit of the first sinne, rejected by M. B. is,

is, *its rendering men guilty of Hell fire*; but the Scripture seems to be of another mind *Rom.* 5. 12. *Wherefore as by one man sinne entred into the world, and death by sinne, and so death passed on all men for that all have sinned.* That all men sinned in *Adam*, that they contracted the guilt of the same death with him, that death *entred by sinne*, the holy Ghost is expresse in. The death here mentioned is, that which God threatned to *Adam*, if he did transgresse, *Gen.* 2. which that it was not death Temporall only, yea not at all, M. B. contends, by denying *Mortality* to be a fruit of this sinne: as also excluding in this very Query all roome for death spirituall, which consists in the defacing of the Image of God in us, which he with this reiects; And what death remaines, but that which hath *Hell* following after it, we shall afterwards consider.

Besides, that death which Christ dyed to deliver us from, was that which we were obnoxious to, upon the account of the first sinne: for he came to *save that which was lost*: *and tasted death to deliver us from death*; *dying to deliver them, who for feare of death were in bondage all their lives*, *Heb.* 2, 13. But that this was such a death, as hath *Hell-fire* attending it, he manifests, by affirming, that he *delivers us from the wrath to come*; By *Hell fire* we understand nothing but the wrath of God for sinne, into *whose hand it is a fearefull thing to fall*, our God being a consuming fire. That the guilt of every sinne is this *death* whereof we speake, that hath both Curse and Wrath attending it, and that it is the proper wages of sinne, the Testimony of God is evident. What other death men are obnoxious to, on the account of the first sinne, that hath not these concomitants, M. B. hath not as yet revealed. By nature also we are *children of wrath*; and on what foot of account our obnoxiousnesse now by nature unto wrath is to be stated, is sufficiently evident by the light of the preceding considerations. §. 18. Rom. 6. 13. Ephes. 2. 3.

The defacing of the Image of God in us, by this sinne, as it is usually asserted, is in the next place denyed. That man was created in the *Image of God*, and wherein that image of God doth consist, was before declared. That we are now borne with that Character upon us, as it was at first enstamped upon us, must be affirmed, or some common cause of the defect, §. 19.

that is in us, wherein all and every one of the posterity of *Adam* are equally concerned, besides that of the first sinne, is to be assigned. That this *latter* cannot be done, hath been already declared. He that shall undertake to make good the *former*, must engage in a more difficult worke, then M. B. in the midst of his other employments, is willing to undertake. To insist on all particulars relating to the *Image* of God in man, how farre it is defaced, whether any thing properly and directly thereunto belonging, be yet left remaining in us; to declare how farre our soules, in respect of their immortall substance, faculties, and Consciences, our *Persons*, in respect of that dominion over the Creatures, which yet by Gods gracious and mercifull Providence we retaine, may be said to bare the Image of God, is a worke of another nature, then what I am now engaged in. For the asserting of what is here denyed by M. B. concerning the defacing of the Image of God in us by sinne, no more is required, but only the tender of some demonstrations to the maine of our intendment in the Assertion, touching the *losse* by the *first sin*, & our present want in the state of nature, of that Righteousnesse and Holinesse, wherein man at his first Creation stood before God, (in reference unto the End whereunto he was Created,) in uprightnesse, and ability of walking unto all well pleasing. And as this will be fully manifested in the consideration of the ensuing particulars instanced in by M. B. so it is sufficiently cleare and evident, from the renovation of that Image, which we have by Jesus Christ, & that expressed both in generall, & in all the particulars wherein we affirme that image to be defaced. *The new man, which we put on in Jesus Christ, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of Him that created him, Coll.* 3. 10. is that which we want, by sinnes defacing (*suo more*) of that Image of God in us, which we had in knowledge; so *Ephes.* 4. 23, 24. That new man is said to consist in the *Renewing* of our mind, whereby after God we are Created in Righteousnesse and Holinesse. So that whereas we were created in the *image of God*, in Righteousnesse and Holinesse, and are to be renewed again by Christ, unto the same condition of his Image in Righteousnesse and Holinesse, we doubt not to affirme, that by the first sinne (the

(the only interposition of generall concernement to all the sons of men,) the Image of God in us was exceedingly defaced. In summe, that which made us sinners, brought sinne and death upon us, that which made us lyable to condemnation, that defaced the image of God in us; that all this was done by the first sinne, the Apostle plainly asserts, *Rom.* 5. 12, 15, 17, 18, *&c.*

To the next particular effect of sinne, by M. B. rejected, (the *darkning of our understandings.*) I shall only enquire of him, whether God made us at first with our *understandings darke*, and ignorant, as to those things which are of absolute necessity that we should be acquainted withall, for the attainment of the End whereunto he made us? For once, I will suppose he will not affirme it; and shall therefore proceed one step farther, and aske him, whether there be not such a darkenesse now upon us by nature, opposed unto that light, that spirituall and saving Knowledge, which is of absolute necessity for every one to have, and be furnished withall, that will againe attaine that glory of God, which we are borne short of: Now because this is that which will most probably be denyed, I shall by the way only desire him. §. 20.

1. To cast aside all the places of Scripture, where it is positively, and punctually asserted, that we are so *darke* and *blind*, and *darkenesse* it selfe in the things of God: and then, §. 21.

2. All those where it is no lesse punctually, and positively asserted, that Christ gives us *Light*, *Knowledge*, *Understanding*, which of our selves we have not. And if he be not able to doe so, then §. 22.

3. To tell me, whether the *darkenesse* mentioned in the former places, and innumerable others, and as to the manner and cause of its removall and taking away, in the latter, be part of that death which passed on all men, by the offence of one, or by what other chance it is come upon us? §. 23.

Of the *enslaving of our wills*, *and the depriving us of power to do good*, there is the same Reason, as of that next before. It is not my purpose to handle the *common place* of the corruption of §. 24.

nature by sinne; nor can I say, that it is well for M. *Biddle*, that he finds none of those effects of sinne in himselfe; n thing, of Darkenesse, Bondage, or Disabillity; or if he do, that he knowes where to charge it, and not on himselfe, and the depravednesse of his own nature? and that because I know none who are more desperately sick, then those who by a *fever* of pride, have lost the sense of their own miserable condition. Only to stop him in his hast from rejecting the evills mentioned, from being effects or consequences of the first sinne, I desire him to peruse a little the ensuing Scriptures: And take them as they come to minde, *Ephes.* 2. 1,2,3,5. *Joh.* 5.25. *Matth.* 8. 22. *Ephes.* 5. 8. *Luk.* 4.18. 2 *Tim.*2.25,26. *Joh.*8 34. *Rom.*6.16. *Gen.*6.5. *Rom.*7.5. *Joh*: 3.6. 1 *Cor.* 2 14. *Rom.*3.12. *Acts* 8.31. *Joh.* 5. 41. *Rom.* 8.7. *Jerem.* 13.23 *&c.*

§.25. The last thing denyed is, its *causing Mortallity*. God threatning man with death if he sinned, *Gen.*2.17. seems to instruct us, that if he had not sinned, he should not have dyed; And upon his sinne, affirming, that on that account he should be dissolved, and returne to his dust, *Gen.* 3. 18, 19. no lesse evidently convinces us, that his sinne caused mortality actually, and in the event. The Apostle also affirming, that *death entred by sinne, and passed upon all, in as much as all have sinned*, seems to be of our mind. Neither can any other sufficient cause be assigned on the account whereof, innocent man should have been actually mortall, or eventually have dyed. M. *Biddle* it seemes is of another perswasion. And for the confirmation of his judgment, gives you the words of the Curse of God to man upon his sinning; *dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt returne*; The strength of his reason therein lying in this, that if God denounced the sentence of *mortallity* on man after his sinning, and for his sin, then mortallity was not an effect of sinne, but man was mortall before in the state of innocency, who doubts but that at this rate he may be able to prove what he pleases.

§. 26. A briefe declaration of our sence, in ascribing *Immortallity* to the first man in the state of *Innocency*, that none be mistaken in the expressions used, may put a close to our considerations of this Chapter. In respect of his own *Essence*

and

and [f] Being, as also of all outward and extrinsecall causes, God alone is eminently and perfectly *immortall*; He only in that sence hath life and *immortality*. Angells and soules of men, in materiall substances, are immortall as to their intrinsecall Essence, free from principles of corruption and mortallity; But yet are obnoxious to it, in respect of that outward cause, (or the power of God) which can at any time reduce them into nothing. The immortallity we ascribe to man in innocency, is only an assured preservation, by the power of God, from *actuall dying*; notwithstanding the possibility thereof, which he was in, upon the account of the constitution of his person, and the principles thereunto concurring: So that though from his own nature, he had a possibillity of *dying*, and in that sence was *mortall*, yet from [g] Gods institution, assigning him life in the way of obedience, he had a possibillity of not dying, and was in that sence immortall, as hath been declared. If any desire farther satisfaction herein, let him consult *Johannes Junius* his Answer to *Socinus* his *Prelections*, in the first Chapter whereof he pretends to answer in proofe the assertion in title, *Primus homo ante lapsum naturâ mortalis fuit*: wherein he partly mistakes the thing in question, which respects not the constitution of mans nature, but the event of the condition wherein he was created. [h] And himselfe in another place states it [i] better.

[f] *Illud corpus ante peccatum, & mortale secundum aliam, & immortale secundum aliam causam dici poterat. id est, mortale, quia poterat mori, immortale, quippe quia poterat non mori. Aliud est enim non posse mori, sicut quosdam naturas immortales creavit Deus, aliud est autem posse non mori; secundum quem modum primus creatus est homo immortalis, quod et præstabatur de ligno vitæ, non de constitutione naturæ: a quo ligno seperatus est, cum peccasset, ut posset mori, qui nisi peccasset posset non mori. Mortalis ergo erit conditione corporis animalis, immortalis autem beneficio conditoris. Si enim corpus animale, utique & mortale, quia & mori poterat, quamvis & immortale dico, quia & mori non poterat.* Augustin. Tom. Tertio. de Genesi ad literam. lib. 6. cap. 24.

[g] *Quicunq; dicit Adam primum hominem mortalem factum, ita ut sive peccaret, sive non peccaret, moreretur in corpore, hoc est de corpore exiret non peccati merito sed necessitate naturæ. Anathema sit.* Concil. Milevitan. cap. 1.

[h] *Quæstio est de immortalitate hominis hujus concreti ex anima & corpore conflati. Quando loquor de morte, de dissolutione hujus concreti loquor.* Socin. contra Puccium pag. 228.

[i] Vid. Rivet. Exercitat. in Gen. cap. 1. exerc. 9.

The summe of the whole may be reduced to what follows. §. 27.
Simply *immortal* and absolutely is God only: *He only hath immortallity.* 1 Tim. 6. 16. Immortall in respect of its whole substance or Essence, is that which is separated from all alteration, which is the

the principle of Corruption, as *Angells*, or is not educed from the power of it, whither of its own accord it should again resolve, as the *soules* of men. The *bodyes* also of the Saints in *Heaven*, yea, and of the wicked in *Hell*, shall be *immortall*, though in their own natures corruptible, being *changed*, and preserved by the power of God. *Adam* was *mortall*, as to the constitution of his *body*, which was apt to dye; *immortall* in respect of his *soule*, in its own substance; *immortall* in their *union* by Gods appointment, and from his preservation, upon his continuance in obedience. By the composition of his body, before his fall, he had a *posse mori*; by the appointment of God, a *posse non mori*; by his fall, a *non posse non mori*.

In this estate, on his disobedience, He was threatned *with death*: and therefore was *Obedience* the tenure whereby he held his grant of *immortallity*, which on his neglect, he was penally to be deprived of. In that estate he had (1.) The *immortallity* mentioned or a power of not dying from the appointment of God. (2.) An *uprightenesse* and integrity of his person before God, with an *ability* to walke with him in all the *Obedience* he required, being made in the Image of God, & upright: (3.) A Right, upon his abode in that condition, to an Eternally blessed life, which he should (4.) Actually have enjoyed. For he had a pledge of it in the *Tree of Life*. He lost it for himselfe & us, which if he never had it, he could not do. The Death, wherewith he was threatned, stood in opposition to all these. It being most ridiculous to suppose, that any thing *penall* in the Scripture comes under the name of death, that was not here threatned to *Adam*. Death of the body, in a deprivation of his immortallity spoken of; of the *soule*, spritually in sin, by the losse of his righteousnesse, and integrity; of both, in their obnoxiousnesse to death eternall, *actually* to be undergone, without deliverance by Christ, in opposition to the right to a better, a blessed condition, which he had. That all these are penall, and called in the Scriptures by the name of Death, is evident to all, that take care to know what is contained in them.

§. 27. For a close then of this Chapter and discourse, let us also propose a few Questions, as to the matter under consideration, and

and see what answer the Scripture will positively give in to our inquiries.

First then.

1. Q. In what state, and condition was man at first created?

A. *God created man in his own Image, in the Image of God created he him, Male and Female Created he them.* Gen. 1. 27.

And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good. v. 31.

In the Image God made he man. Gen. 9. 6.

Lo! this only have I found, that God hath made man UPRIGHT, Eccles. 7. 29.

Put on the new man, which *after God, is created in righteousnesse and Holinesse*, Eccles. 4. 24.

Put on the new man, which *is renewed in knowledge, after the Image of him that Created him*, Col. 3. 10.

Q. 2. Should our First parents have dyed, had they not sinned, or were they obnoxious to death in the state of innocency? §. 28.

A. *And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every Tree of the Garden thou mayst freely eat.*

But of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evill, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely dye, Gen. 2, 16, 17.

By one man sinne entred into the world, and death by sinne, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, Rom. 5. 12.

For the Wages of sinne is death, Rom. 6. 23.

Q. 3. Are we now since the Fall, borne with the Image of God so enstamped on us, as at our first Creation in *Adam*? §. 29.

A. *All have sinned, and come short of the Glory of God*, Rom. 3. 23.

Lo! this only have I found, that God hath made man Upright, *but he hath found out many inventions.* Eccles. 7. 29.

So then, they that are in the flesh cannot please God, Rom. 8 8.

And you who were dead in trespasses and sinnes, Ephes. 2. 1.

For we our selves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts; and pleasures, living in Malice, and envy, hatefull, and hating one another, Titus 3. 3.

The

The old man is corrupt according to deceitfull lusts Ephes. 4. 22.

§. 30. Q. 4. Are we now borne approved of God, and accepted with him, as when we were first created, or what is our condition now by nature, what say the Scriptures hereunto?

A. *We were by nature the Children of wrath as well as others,* Ephes 2. 3.

Except a man be borne againe, he cannot see the Kingdome of God. Joh. 3. 3.

He that believeth not the Sonne, *the wrath of God abideth on him* v. 36.

That which is borne of the flesh is flesh, Joh. 4. 6.

§. 31. Q. 4. Are our understandings by nature able to discerne the things of God, or are they darkened, and blind.

A. *The naturall man receiveth not the things that are of the spirit of God, for they are foolishnesse unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned* 1 Cor. 2. 14.

The light shineth in darknesse, and the darknesse comprehended it not, Joh. 1. 5.

--- To preach deliverance to the captives, *and recovering of sight to the blind.* Luk. 4. 18.

Having their Understandings darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindnesse of their heart, Ephes. 4. 18.

Ye were sometimes darknesse, but now are ye light in the Lord. Ephes. 5. 8.

For God who commanded the light to shine out of darknesse, hath shined into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. 4. 6.

And we know that the Sonne of God is come, and hath given us an Understanding, that we may know him that is true, 1 John 5 20.

§. 32. Q. 5. Are we able to doe those things now in the state of nature, which are spiritually good, and acceptable to God?

A. *The carnall mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be* Rom. 8. 7.

You were dead in trespasses and sinnes, Ephes. 2. 1.

The imagination of mans heart is evill from his youth, Gen. 8. 21.

Can

Can the Æthiopian change his skin, or the Leopard his spots, then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evill, Jerem. 13.23.

For without me yee can do nothing, Joh. 15.5.

Not that we are sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves our sufficiency is of God, 2 Cor. 3.5.

For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing, Rom 7.18.

Q. 6. How came we into this miserable state and condition? §. 33.

A. *Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sinne did my mother conceive me*, Psal. 51.5.

Who can bring a cleane thing out of an uncleane? Not one, Job. 14.4.

That which is borne of the flesh is flesh. Joh. 3.6.

Wherefore as by one man sinne entred into the world, and death by sinne; so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, Rom. 5.12.

Q. 7. Is then the guilt of the first sinne of our first Parents reckoned unto us? §. 34.

A. *But not as the offence so also is the free gift, for if through the offence of one many be dead*, v. 15.

And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: *For the judgement was by one to condemnation*, v. 16.

For by one mans offence death raigned, v. 17.

Therefore by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, v. 18.

By one mans disobedience many were made sinners, v. 20.

Thus, and much more fully, doth the Scripture set out, and declare the condition of man, both *before* and *after* the fall: concerning which, although the most evident demonstration of the latter, lyes in the Revelation made of the exceeding *Efficacy* of that power & Grace, which God in Christ puts forth for our conversion, and delivery from that state and condition, before described; yet so much is spoken of this *darke* side of it, as will render *vaine* the attempts of any, who shall endeavour to plead the cause of corrupted nature, or alleviate the Guilt of the *first sinne*.

It may not be amisse in the winding up of the whole, to

give the Reader a briefe account, of what *sleight* thoughts this *Gentleman* and his Companions have concerning this whole *matter*, of the state and condition of the *first* man, his *fall* or *sinne*, and the interest of all his Posterity therein, which confessedly lye at the bottome of that whole dispensation of Grace in Jesus Christ, which is revealed in the Gospell.

1. For *Adam* himselfe, they are so remote from assigning to him any eminency of *Knowledge*, *Righteousnesse*, or *Holinesse*, in the State wherein he was created: That

1. For his Knowledge, they say he [a] *was a meere great baby, that knew not that he was naked.* So also taking away the difference between the *simple knowledge* of *nakednesse* in innocency, and the knowledge joyned with shame, that followed sinne. [b] *Of his Wife he knew no more but what occur'd to his senses.* Though the expression which he used at first view and sight of her, do plainely argue another manner of Apprehension. *Gen.*2.23,24. For [c] *the tree of the knowledg of good and evill, he knew not the vertue of it.* Which yet I know not how well it agrees with another place of the [d] same Author, where he concludes, that in the state of innocency, there was in *Adam* a predominancy of the naturall appetite, which conquer'd or prevailed to the eating of the *Fruit* of that tree. Also that [e] *being mortall, he knew not himselfe to be so*: The summe is, *he was even a very beast, that knew neither himselfe, his duty, nor the will of God concerning him.*

a *Adamus instar infantis vel pueri se nudum esse ignoravit.* Smalc. de ve. Dei fil.c.7.p.2.

b *De conjuge propria, non nisi sensibus obvia cognovit.* Soci.de stat. prim. Hom. c. 4. p. 119.

c *Vim arboris scientiæ boni & mali perspectam non habuerit.* idem ibid. pag. 197. d Socin. prælect. cap. 3. pag. 8. e *Cum ipse mortalis esset, se tamen mortalem esse nesciverit.* Socin. de stat. prim. Hom. cap. 4. pag. 118.

§.36. 2. For his Righteousnesse and Holinesse, which, as was said before, because he was made *upright*, in the image of God, we ascribe unto him, [f] *Socinus* contend's in one whole chapter, in his *Prelections*, *That he was neither Just, nor Holy, nor ought to be so esteemed or called.*

f *Utrum primus homo ante peccatum justitiam aliquam originalem habuerit? Plerique omnes eum illam habuisse affirmant. Sed ego scire velim* —— *concludamus igitur, Adamum, etiam antequam mandatum illud Dei transgrederetur, revera justum non fuisse. Cum nec impeccabilis esset, nec ullum peccandi occasionem habuisset; vel certe justum eum fuisse affirmari non posse, cum nullo modo constet, eum ulla ratione a peccando abstinuisse.* Socin. prælect. c. 3. p. 8. vid. c.4. p. 11.

And

And [g] *Smalcius* in his confutation of *Franzius* his *Theses de peccato Originali*, all along derides, and laughs to scorne, the apprehension or perswasion, that *Adam* was created in Righteousnesse and Holinesse, or that ever he lost any thing of the Image of God, or that ever he had any thing of the Image of God, beyond or besides that Dominion over the Creatures which God gave him.

g *Fit mentio destitutionis vel carentiæ divinæ gloriæ, ergo privationis Imaginis Dei & justitiæ & Sanctitatis, ejusq; originalis; fit mentio Carentiæ divinæ Gloriæ, ergo in creatione cum homine fuit communicata: ô ineptias!* Smal. Refut. Thes. de peccat. Origi. Disput. 2. pag. 42. *Porro ait* Franzius, *Paulum mox e vestigio imaginem Dei, seu novum hominem ita explicare, quod fuerit conditus primus homo ad justitiam & Sanctimoniam veram. Hic cum erroribus fallatiæ, etiam & fortassis voluntariæ, sunt commixtæ* ——— *Videat lector benevolus quanti sit facienda illatio* Franzii, *dum ait: ergo imago Dei in homine ante lapsum consistebat in concreatâ justitiâ & vera sanctimonia primorum parentum. Si hæc non sunt scopæ dissolutæ, equidem nescio quid eas tandem nominabimur.* Smalcius. ubi sup. p. 50, 51.

[h] Most of the residue of the *Heard*, describing the estate and condition of man, in his creation, do wholly omit any mention of any morrall uprightnesse in him.

h Volkel. de Vera. Relig. lib. 2. cap. 6. pag. 9. edit. cum lib. Crell. de Deo.

And this is the account these *Gentlemen* give us, concerning the condition and state, wherein the *First* man was of God created. An heavy burthen of the earth, it seemes he was, that had neither Righteousnesse, nor Holinesse, whereby he might be enabled to walke before God, in reference to that great end, whereunto he was created; nor any knowledge of God, himselfe, or his Duty. §. 37.

2. For his sin, the great [h] Master of their *Family* disputes, that it was a bare transgression of that precept, of *not eating the fruit* of the Tree of knowledge of Good and Evill. And that [i] *His nature was not vitiated, or corrupted thereby.* Wherein he is punctually followed by the *Raccovian Catechisme*; which also giveth this Reason, why his nature was not *depraved* by it, name- §. 38.

h Socin. Prælect. c. 3. p. 8.

i *Etenim unum illud peccatum per se, non modo universos posteros, sed ne ipsum quidem Adamum, corrumpendi vim habere potuit. Dei vero consilio, in peccati illius pœnam id factum fuisse, nec usquam legitur, & plane incredibile est, imo impium id cogitare* Socin. Prælect cap. 4. Sect. 4. p. 13. *Lapsus Adæ, cum unus actus fuerit, vim eam, quæ depravare ipsam naturam Adami, multo minus posterorum ipsius posset, habere non potuit. Ipsi vero in pœnam irrogatum fuisse, nec Scriptura docet, ut superius exposuimus, & Deum illum, qui omnis æquitatis fons est, incredibile prorsus est id facere voluisse:* Catech Racov. de Cognitis Christ cap. 10. quest. 2.

ly, because it was but *one Act*; so light are their thoughts, and expressions of that great transgression.

§. 39. 3. For his state and condition, [k] they all with open mouth cry out, that he was *Mortall*, and obnoxious to death, which should in a *Naturall* way have come upon him, though he had not sinned. But of this before.

[k] *De Adamo eum immortalem creatum non fuisse, res apertissima est. Nam ex terra creatus, cibis usus, liberis gignendis destinatus, & animalis ante lapsum fuit.* Smalcius de Divin. Jes. Christ. cap. 7. de Promisso Vitæ Æternæ.

§. 40. 4. Farther, that the [l] Posterity of *Adam* were no way concerned, as to their spirituall prejudice, in that sinne of His, as though they should either partake of the guilt of it, or have their nature vitiated, or corrupted thereby: but that the whole doctrine of *Originall sinne*, is a figment of *Austine*, and the *Schoolemen* that followed him, is the constant clamour of them all. And indeed this is the great foundation of all, or the greatest part of their Religion. Hence are the necessity of the satisfaction and merit of Christ, the efficacy of Grace, and the power of the Spirit in conversion, decryed. On this account, is Salvation granted by them, without Christ; a power of keeping all the Commandements asserted; and Justification upon our Obedience; of which, in the processe of our Discourse.

[l] *Concludimus igitur, nullum, improprie etiam loquendo, peccatum originale esse; id est, ex peccato illo primi parentis nullā labem aut pravitatem universo humano generi necessario ingenitam esse, sive inflictam quodāmodo fuisse.* Socin. prælect. cap. 4. Sect. 4. p. 13, 14. *Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est, quare nec liberum arbitrium vitiare potuit. Nec enim è Scriptura id peccatum originis doceri potest.* Catech. Racov. de Cognit. Christ. cap. 10. de lib. Arbit. —— *quædam ex falsissimis principiis de lucuntur. In illo genere illud potissimum est, quod ex peccato (ut vocant) originali deprimitur: de quo ita disputant, ut crimen a primo parente conceptum, in sobolem derivatum esse defendant, ejusq; contagione, tum omnes humanas vires corruptas & depravatas, tum potissimum voluntatis libertatem destructam esse asserant. —— quæ omnia nos pernegemus, utpote & sanæ mentis rationi, & divinæ Scripturæ contraria.* Volkell. de Vera Religi. lib. 5. cap. 18. p. 547, 548. *Prior pars Thesis* Franzii *falsa est. Nam nullum individuum unquam peccato originis fuit infectum. Quia peccatum illud mera est fabula, quam tanquam fœtum alienum fovent Lutherani, & alii.* Smalcius Refut. Thes. Franz. disput. 2. p. 46, 47. Vid. compend. Socinis. c. 3. Smal de vera divin. Jes. Christ. c. 7. *Putas Adami peccatum & inobedientiam eius posteritati imputari. At hoc ais; tibi negamus, quam Christi obedientiam credentibus imputari.* Jonas Schlichtingius, disput. pro Socino adversus Meisnerum p. 251. vide etiam p. 100. *Quibus ita explicatis, facile eos qui —— omnem Adami posteritatem, in ipso Adamo parente suo peccasse; & mortis supplicium vere fuisse commeritum.* idem Comment. in Epist. ad Hebræos ad cap. 7. p. 296.

Such

Such are the thoughts, such are the expressions of M. B's *Masters*, concerning this whole matter. [m] *Such* was *Adam* in their esteem; *Such* was his *Fall*; and such our concernment therein. He had no Righteousnesse, no Holinesse, (yea [n] *Socinus* as length confesses, that he did not believe his soule was immortall.) We contracted no *guilt* in him, derive no *pollution* from him: whether these men are in any measure acquainted with the *plague* of their own hearts, the severity and spirituality of the Law of God, with that *Redemption which is in the bloed of Jesus*, the Lord will one day manifest: *but into their secret let not my soule dejcend.* §. 41.

m *Ista sapientia rerum divinarum, & sanctimonia, quam Adamus ante lapsum tribuit Franzius, una cum aliis, Idea quædam est, in cerebro ipsorum nata.*

Smalcius ubi sup. n Socin. Epist. 5. ad Johan. Volkell pag. 489.

Least the weakest, or meanest *Reader* should be startled with the mention of these things, not finding himselfe ready furnished with Arguments from Scripture, to disprove the boldnesse and folly of these men in their Assertions, I shall adde some few Arguments, whereby the severalls, by them denyed, and opposed, are confirmed from Scriptures; the places before mentioned, being in them cast into that forme and Method, wherein they are readily subservient to the purpose in hand. §. 42.

1. That man was Created in the *Image* of God, in Knowledge, Righteousnesse, and Holinesse, is evident on the ensuing considerations. §. 43.

I. He who was made *very good and upright*, in a morall consideration, had the *Originall Righteousnesse* pleaded for: for morall goodnesse, integrity, and uprightnesse, is equivalent unto Righteousnesse; so are the words used in the description of *Job. cap.* 1. *v.* 1. And *Righteous* and *Upright* are termes equivalent. *Psal.* 33. 1. Now that man was made thus good and upright, was manifested in the Scriptures, cited in answer to the question before proposed, concerning the condition wherein our first Parents were created. And indeed this Uprightnesse of man, this morall rectitude, was his formall aptitude, and fitnesse, for, and unto that obedience, which God required of him, and which was necessary for the end, whereunto he was created.

2. He who was created *Perfect* in his kind, was created with the *Originall Righteousnesse* pleaded for. This is evident from §. 44.

hence

hence, becauſe Righteouſneſſe and Holineſſe is a perfection of a Rationall being, made for the ſervice of God. This in Angells is called the *Truth*, or that originall Holineſſe and rectitude, which the Divells *abode not in*, *Joh.* 8. 44. Now (as before,) man was created *very good and upright*, therefore perfect, as to his ſtate and condition: and whatever is in him of imperfection, flows from the corruption and depravation of nature.

§. 45. 3. He that was created in the Image of God, was created in a ſtate of *Righteouſneſſe*, *Holineſſe*, and *Knowledge*. That *Adam* was created in the *Image of God*, is plainely affirmed in Scripture, and is not denyed. That by the Image of God is eſpecially intended the qualitys mentioned, is manifeſt from that farther deſcription of the Image of God, which we have given us in the Scriptures before produced, in anſwer to our firſt Queſtion. And what is recorded of the firſt man in his primitive condition, will not ſuffer us to eſteeme him ſuch a baby in knowledge, as the *Socinians* would make him. His impoſing of names on all Creatures, his knowing of his wife on firſt view, &c. exempt him from that imputation. Yea the very [n] Heathens could conclude, that he was very wiſe indeed, who firſt gave names to things.

[n] Οἶμαι μὲν ἐγὼ τὸν ἀληθέστατον λόγον περὶ τούτων εἶναι ὦ Σώκρατες, μείζω τινὰ δύναμιν εἶναι ἢ ἀνθρωπείαν, τὴν θεμένην τὰ πρῶτα ὀνόματα τοῖς πράγμασιν *Plato in Cratylo.*

§. 46. II. For the diſproving of that *Mortallity*, which they aſcribe to man in *innocency*. The enſuing Arguments may ſuffice.

1. He that was created in the Image of God in *Righteouſneſſe and Holineſſe*, whilſt he continued in that ſtate and condition, was immortall. That man was ſo created, lyes under the demonſtration of the foregoing Arguments, and Teſtimonyes. The Aſſertion thereupon, or the inference of *Immortallity* from the Image of God, appeares on this double conſideration. 1. In our Renovation by Chriſt, unto the image of God, we are renewed to a bleſſed Immortallity: and our *likeneſſe* to God conſiſted no leſſe in that, then in any other communinicable property of his Nature. 2. Where ever is naturally perfect Righteouſneſſe, there is naturally perfect life, that is, Immortallity: this is included in the very tenour of the promiſe

misse of the Law. *If a man keep my statutes he shall live in them, Levit.* 18.5.

2. That which the first man *Contracted*, & drew upon himselfe by sinne, was not *naturall* to him before he sinned: But that man contracted, and drew death upon himselfe, or made himselfe liable and obnoxious unto it by sinne, is proved by all the Texts of Scripture, that were produced above, in answer to our second Question. As *Gen.* 2. 17, 19. *Rom.* 5. 12, 14. *chap.* 6. 23. &c. §. 47.

3. That which is besides, and *contrary* to nature, was not *naturall* to the first man: but death is besides, and contrary to nature, as the voyce of nature abundantly testifieth; therefore to man in his primitive condition it was not naturall. §. 48.

Unto these may sundry other Arguments be added, from the *Promise of the Law*, the *End* of mans Obedience, His constitution and state, denying all *proximate* causes of death, &c. But these may suffice.

III. That the sinne of *Adam* is not to be confined to the meere eating of the fruit of *the tree of knowledge of Good and Evill*, but had its rise in *Infidelity*, and comprised universall Apostacy from God, in disobedience to the law of his creation, and dependance on God, I have elsewhere demonstrated, and shall not need here againe to insist upon it. That it began in *Infidelity*, is evident from the beginning of the Temptation, wherewith he was overcome. It was to doubt of the Truth, and veracity of God, to which the woman was at first sollicited by Sathan, *Gen.* 3. 4. *Hath God said so?* pressing that it should be otherwise, then they seemed to have cause to apprehend from what God said: And their acquiescence in that reply of Sathan, without revolving to the truth, and faithfullnesse of God, was plaine *Unbeliefe*. Now as Faith is the root of all Righteousnesse and Obedience, so is *Infidelity* of all disobedience. Being overtaken, conquered, *deceived* into infidelity, man gave up himselfe to act contrary to God, and his will, shooke off his soveraignty, rose up against his Law, and manifested the frame of his heart, in the pledge of his disobedience, eating the fruit that was sacramentally forbidden him. §. 94. Diatrib. de Justit. Divin. Vin.

§. 50. IV. That all men ſinned in *Adam*, and that his ſinne is imputed to all his Poſterity, is by them denyed, but is eaſily evinced. For

1. By whom ſinne *entred into the world*, ſo that all *ſinned in him*, and are made *ſinners* thereby, ſo that alſo his ſinne is called the *ſinne of the world*, in him all mankind ſinned, and his ſinne is imputed to them. But that this was the condition, and ſtate of the firſt ſinne of *Adam*, the Scriptures before mentioned, in anſwer to our *ſeventh queſtion*, do abundantly manifeſt; and thence alſo is his ſinne called the ſinne of the world: *John* 1.29.

§. 51. 2. In whom *all are dead*, and in whom they have contracted the guilt of death and condemnation, in him they have all ſinned, and have his ſinne imputed to them. But in *Adam all are dead*: 1 *Cor*: 15.22. as alſo *Rom*:5. 12,14,15,16,17,18. And death is the *wages* of ſinne only, *Rom*: 6.23.

§. 52. 3. As by the *Obedience* of Chriſt we are made *Righteous*, ſo by the *diſobedience* of *Adam* we are made *ſinners*. So the Apoſtle expreſsly, *Rom*: 5. but we are made *Righteous* by the Obedience of Chriſt, by the imputation of it to us, as if we had performed it: 1 *Cor*: 1.30. *Phil*: 3. 9. Therefore are we *ſinners*, by the imputation of the ſinne of *Adam* to us, as though we had committed it: which the Apoſtle alſo affirmes. To what hath been ſpoken, from the conſideration of that ſtate and condition, wherein by Gods appointment, in reference to all mankind, *Adam* was placed, namely, of a *naturall*, and *politicall*, or *Federall* Head, (of which the Apoſtle treats, 1 *Cor*. 15.) from the loſſe of that Image, wherein he was created, whereunto by Chriſt we are renewed, many more words like theſe might be added.

§. 53. To what hath been ſpoken, there is no need that much ſhould be added, for the removall of any thing inſiſted on, to the ſame purpoſe with M. *B*'s intimations, in the *Raccovian Catechiſme*. But yet ſeeing that that task alſo is undertaken, that which may ſeeme neceſſary for the diſcharging of what may thence be expected, ſhall briefely be ſubmitted to the Reader. To this Head they ſpeake, in the firſt Chapter, of the way to Salvation; the firſt Queſtion whereof, is of the import enſuing.

Q. [a] *Seeing thou saidst in the beginning, that this life, which leadeth to immortality, is Divinely revealed, I would know of thee, why thou saidst so?*

A. *Because, as man by nature hath nothing to do with immortality (or hath no interest in it) so by himselfe he could by no means know the way which leadeth to immortality.*

[a] *Cum dixeris initio, hanc viam quæ ad immortalitatem ducat esse divinitus patefactam, scire velim, cur id à te dictum sit?*

Propterea, quia ut homo naturâ nihil habet commune cum immortalitate, ita eam ipse viam, quæ nos ad immortalitatem duceret, nulla ratione per se cognoscere potuit. Catech. Raccov. de via Salut. cap. 1.

Both Question and Answer being sophistical and ambiguous, the sence and intendment of them, as to their application to the matter in hand, and by them aymed at, is first to be rectifyed by some few distinctions, and then the whole will cost us very little farther trouble.

1. There is, or hath been, a twofold way to a blessed immortallity, (1.) The way of perfect Obedience to the Law, for he that did it was to *live therein*, (2.) the way of *Faith* in the bloud of the Sonne of God: For he that *believeth* shall be *Saved*.

2. Man by nature may be considered two wayes, (1.) As he was in his created *condition*, not tainted, corrupted, weakened, nor lost by sinne, (2.) As *fallen*, dead, polluted, and guilty.

3. Immortallity is taken either (1.) Nakedly, and purely in its selfe, for an eternall abiding of that which is said to be immortall. (2.) For a blessed condition, and state, in that abiding and continuance.

4. That expression (*by nature*) referring to man in his created condition, not fallen by sinne, may be taken two wayes (1.) *Strictly*, for the consequences of the naturall principles whereof man was constituted, or (2.) More *largely* it comprizes Gods constitution and appointment, concerning man in that estate.

On these considerations, it will be easy to take off this Head of our Catechist's discourse, whereby also the remaining trunke will fall to the ground.

I say then, man by *nature*, in his primitive created condition,

Rom. 2. 7, 8, 9 was by the appointment and constitution of God, *immortall*, as to the continuance of his life, and knew the way of perfect *legall Obedience*, tending to a blessed *Immortallity*, and that by *himselfe*, or by vertue of the Law of his Creation, which was concreated with him: But *fallen* man in his naturall condition, being dead spiritually, obnoxious to death temporall and eternall, doth by no meanes know *of himselfe*, nor *can know*, the way of *Faith* in Jesus Christ, leading to a blessed immortallity and Glory.

§. 54. It is not then our want of interest in *immortallity*, upon the account whereof we know not of *our selves* the way to immortallity by the bloud of Christ; but there are two other reasons that enforce the Truth of it.

Joh. 1. 18. 1 Cor. 2. 7. Ephes. 3. 8, 9, 10, 11. Col. 2. 2, 3. 1 Tim. 3. 16. 1. Because it is a way of *meere Grace and mercy*, hidden from all eternity in the treasures of Gods infinite Wisdome, and soveraigne Will, which he neither prepared for man in his created condition, nor had man any need of; nor is it in the least discovered by any of the Workes of God, or the Law written in the heart; but is solely revealed from the *bosome of the Father*, by the *only begotten Sonne*, neither Angells, nor men, being able to discover the least glimpse of that Mystery, without that Revelation.

Ephes. 2. 1. Joh. 1. 5. Rom. 3. 17, 18 Rom. 8. 7, 8. 2 Cor. 2, 14. Tit. 3. 3. Ephes. 2. 8. 4. 18. Col. 1. 13. 2. 13. &c. 2. Because man in his *fallen* condition, though there be retained in his heart some weake and faint expressions of Good and Evill, reward and punishment, *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. yet is spiritually *dead, blind, alienated from God; ignorant, darke, stubborne*, so far from being able of himselfe to find out the way of Grace unto blessed immortallity, that he is not able upon the Revelation of it, savingly, and to the great end of its proposall, to *receive, apprehend, believe, and walke* in it, without a new Spirituall *Creation*, *Resurrection* from the dead, or *new birth*, wrought by the *exceeding greatnesse of the power of God*. And on these two doth depend our disabillity to discover, and know the way of Grace, leading to Life and Glory. And by this briefe removall of the covering, is the weakenesse, and nakednesse of their whole ensuing Discourse so discovered, as that I shall speedily take it, with its offence, out of the way. They proceed.

Q. *But*

Q. [b] *But why hath man nothing to do with (or no interest in) immortallity?* §. 55.

A. *Therefore, because from the beginning he was formed of the ground, and so was created mortall: and then, because he transgressed the command given him of God, and so by the decree of God, expressed in his command, was necessarily subject to eternall death?*

[b] *Cur vero nihil commune habet homo cum immortalitate? Idcirco, quod ab initio de humo formatus, propterea q; mortalis creatus fuerit: deinde vero, quod mandatum Dei, ipsi propositum, transgressus sit; ideoq; decreto Dei ipsius in mandato expresso, aeternæ morti necessario subjectus fuerit.*

1. It is true, man was created of the dust of the *Earth*, as to his bodily substance; yet it is as true, that moreover God breathed into him the breath of *life*, whereby he became a *living soule*; & in that immediate constitution, & framing from the hand of God, was free from all nextly disposing causes unto dissolution: but his immortallity we place on another account, as hath been declared, which is no way prejudiced by his being made of the *Ground*.

2. The second reason belongs unto man only as having sinned, and being fallen out of that condition, and Covenant, wherein he was created. So that I shall need only to let the Reader know, that the Eternall Death, in the judgment of our Catechists, whereunto man was subject by sinne, was only an eternall dissolution or annihilation, (or rather an abode under dissolution, dissolution it selfe being not penall) and not any abiding punishment, as will afterwards be farther manifest. They goe on,

Q. [c] *But how doth this agree with those places of Scripture, wherein it is written, that man was created in the Image of God, and created unto immortallity, and that death entred into the world by sinne.* Gen. 1. 26. Wisd. 2. 23. Rom. 5. 12. §. 56.

[c] *Qui vero id conveniet iis Scripturæ locis, in quibus Scriptum extat, hominem ad imaginem Dei creatum esse, & creatum ad immortalitatem, & quod mors per peccatum in mundum introiret.* Gen. 1. 26, 27. Sap. 2. 23. Rom. 5. 12.

Quod ad Testimonium attinet, quod homini creatum ad imaginem Dei pronunciat, sciendum est, imaginem Dei non significare immortalitatem: (*quod hinc patet, quod Scriptura eo Tempore, quo homo æternæ morti subjectus erat, agnoscat in homine istam imaginem.* Gen 9. 6. Jacob. 3. 9.) *sed præstatem hominis, & dominium in omnes res a Deo conditas supra terram, designare: ut idem locus, in quo de hac eadem imagine agitur.* Gen. 1. 26. *aperte indicat.*

A. *As to the Testimony, which declareth that man was created in the Image of God, it is to be known, that the Image of God doth not signify immortallity; (which is evident from hence, because at that time, when man was subject to eternall death, the Scripture acknowledgeth in him that Image,* Gen. 9. 6. Jam. 3. 9.) *but it denoteth the power and dominion over all things, made of God on the Earth: as the same place, where this Image is treated of, clearely sheweth:* Gen. 1. 26.

The Argument for that state and Condition, wherein we affirme man to have been created, from the consideration of the *Image* of God, wherein he was *made*, and whereunto in part we are *renewed*, was formerly insisted on. Let the Reader looke back unto it, and he will quickly discerne, how little is here offered to enervate it in the least. For

1. They cannot prove, that man in the condition and state of sinne, doth retaine any thing of the Image of God; the places mentioned, as *Gen.* 9. 6. and *Jam.* 3. 9. testify only, that he was made in the Image of God at first, but that he doth still retaine the image they intimate not; nor is the inference used in the places, taken from what man is, but what he was created.

2. That the *Image* of God did not consist in any one excellency, hath been above declared: So that the Argument to prove that it did not cosist in immortallity, because it did consist in the dominion over the Creatures, is no better then that would be, which should conclude, that the Sun did not give light because it gives heat. So that

3. Though the *Image* of God, as to the maine of it, in reference to the end of everlasting communion with God, (whereunto we were created) was utterly lost by sinne, or else we could not be renewed unto it againe by Jesus Christ, yet as to some footsteps of it, in reference to our fellow Creatures, so much might be, and was retained, as to be a Reason

one

one towards another, for our preservation from wrong and violence.

4. That place of *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let us make man in our Image, and let him have dominion over the fish of the Sea, &c.* Is so farre from proving, that the *Image* of God, wherein man was created, did consist only in the dominion mentioned, that it doth not prove that dominion to have been any part of, or to belong unto, that Image. It is rather a grant made to them, who were made in the Image of God, then a description of *that Image* wherein they were made.

It is evident then, notwithstanding any thing here excepted to the contrary, that the Immortallity pleaded for, belonged to the Image of God, and from mans being created therein, is rightly inferred, as above was made more evident.

§. 57. Upon the Testimony of the *Book of Wisdome*, it being confessedly *Apocryphall*, I shall not insist. Neither do I think, that in the Originall any new Argument, to that before mentioned, of the image God, is added: but that is evidently pressed, & the nature of the Image of God somewhat explained. The words are, "Οτι ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ ἀφθαρσίᾳ, καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἰδιότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν. φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. πειράζουσι δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὄντες. The opposition that is put between the creation of man in integrity, and the Image of God, in one verse, and the entrance of sinne, by the envy of the Divell, in the next, plainely evinces, that the mind of the Author of that book was, that man, by reason of his being created in the image of God, was immortall in his primitive condition. That which followes, is of an other nature, concerning which they thus enquire and Answer.

§. 58.

d *What moreover wilt thou answer to the third Testimony?* d *Quid porro ad tertium respondebis?*

A. The Apostle in that place treateth not of immortallity, but of death it selfe. But mortallity differeth much from death: for a man may be mortall and yet never dye. But *Apostolus eo in loco non agit de immortalitate, verum de morte ipsa: mortalitas vero a morte multum differt; siquidem potest esse quis mortalis, nec tamen unquam mori.*

1. The Apostle eminently treats of mans becomming obnoxious to death, which untill he was, he was immortall. For he sayes

sayes, that death entred the world by sinne, and passed on all men, not actually, but in the guilt of it, and obnoxiousnesse to it. By what means death entred into the world, or had a right so to do, by that meanes man lost the immortallity, which before he had.

2. It is true, a man may be mortall as to state and condition, and yet by Almighty power be preserved, and delivered from actuall dying, as it was with *Enoch* and *Elijah*, but in an ordinary course he that is *mortall* must dye, & is directly obnoxious to death: but that which we plead for from those words of the Apostle is, that man by Gods constitution and appointment, was so *immortall*, as not to be lyable, nor obnoxious to death, untill he sinned. But they will prove their assertion in their progresse.

§. 59. Q. [c] *What therefore is the sence of these words, that death entred into the world by sinne?*

This, that Adam for sin by the decree and sentence of God, was subject to eternall death; and therefore all men, because, or in as much as they are borne of him, are subject to the same eternall death. And that this is so, the comparison of Christ with Adam, which the Apostle instituteth, from v. 12. *to the end of the chapter, doth declare.*

[c] *Quæ igitur est horum verborum sententia: quod mors per peccatum introierit in mundum?*

Hæc, quod Adamus ob peccatum, decreto & sententia Dei æternæ morti subjectus est; proinde, omnes homines, eo quod ex eo nati sunt, eidem æternæ morti subjaceant: rem ita esse, collatio Christi cum Adamo, quam Apostolus eodem capite, v. 12. *ad finem, instituit, indicio est.*

Be it so: that this is the meaning of those words, yet hence it inevitably follows, that man was no way liable, or obnoxious to death, but upon the account of the commination of God annexed to the law he gave him. And this is the whole of what we affirme: namely, that by Gods appointment man was *immortall*, and the tenure of his *immortallity* was his obedience; And thereupon, his Right thereunto he lost by his Trangression.

2. This is farther evident from the comparison between Christ and *Adam*, instituted by the Apostle. For as we are all dead without Christ, and his *righteousnesse*, and have not the least right to life, or a blessed immortallity; so antecedently to the consideration of *Adam*, & his *disobedience*, we were not in the least ob-

obnoxious unto death, or any way lyable to it, in our primitive condition.

§. 60. And this is all that our Catechists have to plead for themselves, or to except against our Arguments, and Testimonys to the cause in hand. Which how weake it is in it selfe, and how short it comes of reaching to the strength we insist on, as little comparison of it, with what went before, will satisfie the pious Reader.

What remains of that chapter, consisting in the depravation of two or three Texts of Scripture, to another purpose then that in hand, I shall not divert to the consideration of; seeing it will more orderly fall under debate in another place.

§. 61. What our Catechists adde elsewere about originall sinne, or their attempt to disprove it, being considered, shall give a close to this discourse.

Their tenth Chapter is *de libero Arbitrio*, where after, in Answer to the first Question proposed, they have asserted, that it is in our power to yield obedience unto God, as having free will in our Creation so to do, and having by no way, or meanes, lost that *liberty or power*: Their second Question is.

§ Is not this free will corrupted by Originall sinne?

§ *Nonne peccato originis hoc liberum arbitrium vitiatum est?*

A. *There is no such thing as Originall sinne: wherefore that cannot vitiate free will: Nor can that Original sin be proved out of the Scripture: and the fall of Adam being but one act, could not have that force as to corrupt his own nature, much lesse that of his Posterity. And that it was inflicted on him as a punishment, neither doth the Scripture teach, and it is incredible, that God, who is the fountaine of all goodnesse, would so do.*

Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est: Quare nec liberum arbitrium vitiare potuit; nec enim e Scriptura id peccatum originis doceri potest, & lapsus Adæ cum unus actus fuerit vim eam, quæ depravare ipsam naturam Adami, multominus vero posterorum ipsius posset, habere non potuit; ipsi vero in pœnam irrogatum fuisse, nec Scriptura docet, uti superius exposuimus; & Deum illum, qui omnis æquitatis fons est, incredibile prorsus est, id facere voluisse. Cap. 10. de lib. Arbit. q. 2.

§. 62. 1. This is yet plaine dealing. And it is, well that men who know neither God nor themselves, have yet so much honesty left, as to speake down right what they intend. Quickly dispatched; there is no such thing as originall sinne. To us the denying

denying of it, is one Argument to prove it. Were not men blind, and dead in sinne, they could not but be sensible of it. But men swimming with the waters, feele not the strength of the streame.

§. 63. 2. But doth the Scripture teach no such thing? Doth it nowhere teach, that we who were *created upright*, in the *image of God*, are now *dead in trespasses and sinnes*, *by nature children of wrath*, having the *wrath of God upon us*, being *blind* in our understandings, *and alienated from the life of God*, not able *to receive the things that are of God*, which are *spiritually discerned*, our *carnall minds being enmity to God*, *not subject to his Law*, nor can be. That our hearts are *stony*, our affections *sensuall*, that we are wholly *come short of the Glory of God*. That every *figment* of our heart is evil, so that we can neither *think* nor *speak*, nor *do*, that which is spiritually good, or acceptable to God; that being *borne of the flesh we are flesh*, and unlesse we *are borne againe*, can by no meanes enter into the *Kingdome of Heaven*. That all this is come upon us by the sinne of *one man*, whence also Judgment passed on all men to condemnation? Can nothing of all this be proved from the Scripture? These *Gentlemen* know, that we contend not about words or expressions; let them grant this hereditary corruption of our natures, alienation from God, impoteney to good, deadnesse and obstinacy in sinne, want of the Spirit, Image, and Grace of God, with obnoxiousnesse thereon to eternall condemnation; and give us a fitter expression to declare this state and condition by, in respect of every ones personall interest therein, and we will, so it may please them, call *it originall sinne* no more.

§. 64. 3. It is not impossible, that one act should be so high, and intense in its kind, as to induce an habit into the subject, and so *Adams* nature be vitiated by it; and he begot a Sonne in his *own likenesse*. The Divells upon one sinne, became obstinate in all the wickednesse, that their nature is capable of. 2. This one act was a *breach of Covenant* with God, upon the tenour and observation whereof, depended the enjoyment of all that strength, and Rectitude with God, wherewith by the law of his creation, man was endued withall. 3. All mans *Covenant Good*, for that eternall end, to which he was created, depending upon his conformity to God, his subjection to him, and

him, and dependance on him, all which by that one sinne, he wilfully cast away, for himselfe and posterity, (whose common, naturall, and *federall* head he was.) and righteously fell into that condition which we described. 4. The Apostle is much of a different mind from our Catechists, *Rom.* 5. 15, 16, &c. as hath been declared.

4. What is *credible* concerning God & his goodnesse with these *Gentlemen* I know not. To me, that is not only in it selfe *credible*, which he hath revealed concerning himselfe, but of *necessity to be believed*. That he gave man a Law, threatning him, and all his Posterity in him and with him, with *eternall death* upon the breach of it, that upon that sinne, he cast all mankind judicially out of Covenant, imputing that sinne unto them all, unto the guilt of condemnation, seeing it is his *Judgement that they who commit sinne are worthy of death*, and that he is of purer eyes then to *behold iniquity*, is to us credible, yea (as was said) of necessity to be believed. But they will answer the proofes that are produced from Scripture, in the asserting of this Originall sinne. §. 65.

e *But that there is Originall sinne, Those Testimonyes seeme to prove* Gen. 6.5. *Every cogitation of the heart of man is only evill every day. And* Gen. 8. 21. *The cogitation of mans heart is evill from his youth.*

A. *These Testimonyes deale concerning voluntary sinne: from them therefore Originall sinne cannot be proved. As for the first, Moses sheweth it to be such a sinne for whose sake God repented him that he had made man and decreed to destroy him with a flood: which certainly can by no meanes be affirmed concerning a sinne which should be in no men by nature, such as they think Originall sinne to be. In the other he sheweth, that the sinne of man shall not have that efficacy, that God should punnish the world for it with a flood; which by no means agreeth to Originall sinne.* §. 66.

g *Verumtamen esse peccatū originis ilkis Testimonia docere videntur:* Gen. 6.5. &c. Gen. 8.21. *Hæc Testimonia agunt de peccato voluntario: ex iis itaq; effici nequit peccatum originis quod autem ad primum attinet, Moses id peccatum ejusmodi fuisse docet cujus causa pœnituisse Deum quod hominem creasset, & eum diluvio punire decrevisset; Quod certe de peccato quod homini naturâ inesset, quale peccatum originis censeat, affirmari nullo pacto potest. In altero vero Testimonio docet, peccatum hominis eam vim habiturum non esse, ut Deus mundum diluvio propter illud puniret: quod etiam peccato originis nullo modo convenit.*

That this attempt of our Catechists is most vaine and frivolous, will quickly appeare, for 1. Suppose Originall sinne §. 67.

be not asserted in those places, doth it follow there is no Originall sin? do they not know, that we affirme it to be revealed in, and proved by an hundred places besides? And doe they think to overthrow it by their exception against two or three of them? when if it be taught in any one of them it suffices. 2. The words as by them rendred, loose much of the efficacy for the confirmation of what they oppose, which in the Originall they have. In the first place, it is not *every thought of mans heart*, but every imagination or figment of *the thoughts of his heart*. The *motus primo primi*, the very naturall frame and temper of the heart of man, as to its first motions towards good or evill, are doubtlesse expressed in these words: so also is it in the latter place.

§. 68. We say then, that *Originall sin* is taught & proved in these places: Not singly or exclusively to actuall sinnes, not *a parte ante*, or from the causes of it, but from its effects. That such a frame of heart is universally by nature in all mankind, and every *individuall* of them; as that it is ever, always, or continually casting, coyning, and devising evill, and that *only*, without the intermixture of any thing of another kind, that is truly and spiritually good, is taught in these places; and this is Originall sinne. Nor is this disproved by our *Catechists*.

For

§. 69. 1. Because the sinne spoken of is voluntary, therefore it is not Originall, will not be granted. Originall sin, as it is taken for *peccatum Originans*, was voluntary in *Adam*; and as it is *Originatum* in us, is in our wills habitually, and not against them, in any actings of it, or them. (2.) The Effects of it in the coyning of sinne, and in the *thoughts* of mens hearts, are all voluntary; which are here mentioned to demonstrate, and manifest that roote from whence they spring, that prevailing *principle*, and predominant habit, from whence they so uniformely proceed.

2. Why it doth not agree to *Originall sin*, that the account mentioned, *v.* 6. of Gods repenting that He made man, and his resolution to destroy him, these Gentlemen offer not one word of Reason to manifest. We say, that it can agree to no other, but this originall sinne, with its infallible effects, wherein all mankind are equally concerned, and so became

equally

equally lyable to the juſt Judgment of God; though ſome from the ſame Principle had acted much more boldly againſt his Holy Majeſty then others: (2.) Its being in men by nature doth not at all leſſen its guilt. It is not in *their nature* as created, nor in them ſo by nature: but is by the fall of *Adam* come upon the nature of all men, dwelling in the perſon of every one; which leſſeneth not its guilt, but manifeſts its advantage for provocation.

3. Why the latter teſtimony is not applicable to Originall ſinne, they informe us not. The words joyned with it, are an expreſſion of that patience, and forbearance which God reſolved, and promiſed to exerciſe towards the world, with a *non Obſtante*, for *ſin*. Now what ſin ſhould this be, but that which is the ſin of the world. That actuall ſinnes are excluded we ſay not; but that *Originall ſinne* is expreſſed, and aggravated by the Effects of it, our *Catechiſts* cannot diſprove. There are many conſiderations of theſe Texts, from whence the Argument from them, for the proof of that corruption of nature, which we call *Originall ſin*, might be much *improved*; but that is not my preſent buſineſſe; Our Catechiſts adminiſtring no occaſion to ſuch a Diſcourſe. But they take ſome other texts into conſideration.

What thinkeſt thou of that which David ſpeakes Pſal. 51. 7. *Behold, I was ſhapen in iniquity, and in ſinne did my mother conceive me.* §. 70.

It is to be obſerved, that David doth not here ſpeake of any men but himſelfe alone nor that ſimply, but with reſpect to his fall: and uſes that forme of ſpeaking, which you have in him againe, Pſal. 58. 4. *Wherefore Originall ſinne cannot be evinced by this Teſtimony.*

Quid vero ea de re ſentis quod David ait Pſal. 51. 7. *Animadvertendum eſt, hic Davidem non agere de quibuſvis hominibus, ſed de ſe tantum, nec ſimpliciter, ſed habita ratione lapſus ſui: & eo loquendi modo uſum eſſe, cujus exemplum apud eundem Davidem habes* Pſal. 58. 4. *Quamobrem nec eo Teſtimonio effici prorſus poteſt peccatum originis.*

But

1. Though *David* ſpeake of himſelfe, yet he ſpeakes of himſelfe, in reſpect of that which was common to himſelfe with all mankind, being a *child of wrath as well as others*. Nor can theſe Gentlemen intimate any thing of ſinne and iniquity, in the *conception and birth of David*, that was not common

to all others with him. Any mans confession for himselfe of a particular guilt in a common sinne, doth not free others from it. Yea it proves all others to be partakers in it, who share in that condition wherein he contracted the guilt.

2. Though *David* mention this by occasion of his fall, as having his conscience made tender, and awakened to search into the roote of his sinne, and transgression thereby; yet it was no part of his fall, nor was he ever the more or lesse conceived in sinne and brought forth in iniquity, for that fall, which were ridiculous to imagine. He here acknowledges it, upon the occasion of his fall, which was a fruit of the sinne wherewith he was borne, *James* 1. 14, 15. but was equally guilty of it before his fall and after.

3. The expression here used, and that of *Psal.* 58. 3. *The wicked are enstranged from the wombe, they goe astray as soon as they be borne speaking lyes*; exceedingly differ. Here *David* expresses what was his infection in the womb, there what is wicked mens constant practile from the womb. In himselfe he mentions the roote of all actuall sin; in them the constant fruit that springs from that root in unregenerate men. So that by the favour of these Catechists, I yet say; that *David* doth here acknowledge a sin of nature, a sin wherewith he was defiled from his conception, and polluted when he was warmed, and so fomented in his Mothers womb, and therefore this place doth prove Originall sinne.

§. 71. One place more they call to an account, in these words. *But Paul saith, that in Adam all sinned.* Rom. 5. 12.

At Paulus ait Rom. 5. 12. *in Adamo &c.*

It is not in that place, in *Adam* all sinned. But in the Greeke the words are ἐφ ᾧ which Interpreters do frequently render in Latine *in quo*, in whom, which yet may be rendred by the particles *quoniam* or *quatenus*, because, or in as much, as in like places *Rom.* 8 3. *Phil.* 3. 12. *Heb.* 2. 18. 2 *Cor.* 5. 4. It appeareth therefore that neither can Originall sinne be built up out of this place.

Non habetur eo loco, in Adam omnes peccasse; verum in Graeco verba sunt ἐφ ᾧ *quae passim interpretes reddunt latine, in quo, quae tamen reddi possunt per particulas quoniam aut quatenus, ut e locis similibus,* Rom. 8. 3 Phil. 3. 12. Heb 2. 18. 2 Cor. 5. 4. *videre est. Apparet igitur ne; ex hoc loco extrui posse peccatum originis.*

1. Stop

1. Stop these men from this shifting hole, and you may with much ease entangle and catch them 20 times a day. This word may be rendred otherwise, for it is so in another place. A course of proceedure that leaves nothing certaine in the Booke of God. 2. In two of the places cited, the words are not ἐφ ᾧ, but ἐν ᾧ *Rom.* 5. 3. *Heb.* 2. 18. 3. The places are none of them parallell to this; for here the Apostle speakes of persons, or a person in an immediate precedency, in them of things. But 4. render ἐφ ᾧ by *quoniam, because*, or *for that*, as our English translation doth: The Argument is no lesse evident for Originall sinne, then if they were rendred by, *in whom*. In the beginning of the verse the Apostle tels us, that death entred the world by the sinne of one man, that one man of whom he is speaking, namely *Adam*, and passed upon all men: of which dispensation, that death passed on all men, he gives you the reason in these words, for that all have sinned, that is, in that sinne of that one man, whereby death entred on the world, and passed on them all. I wonder how our Catechists could once imagine; that this exception against the Translation of those words, should enervate the Argument from the text, for the proofe of all mens guilt of the first sinne; seeing the conviction of it, is no lesse evident from the words, if rendred according to their desire.

And this is the summe of what they have to offer, for the acquitment of themselves from the guilt and staine of *Originall sinne*, and for answer to the three Testimonyes on its behalfe, which themselves chose to call forth, upon the strength whereof they so confidently reject it at the entrance of their Discourse, and in the following question triumph upon it, as a thing utterly discarded from the thoughts of their *Catechumens*: what Reason or ground they have for their confidence, the Reader will judge. In the meane time, it is sufficiently knowne, that they have touched very little of the strength of our cause; nor once mentioned the Testimonyes and Arguments, on whose evidence and strength in this businesse we rely. And for themselves who write and teach these things, I should much admire their happinesse, did I not so much as I do pitty them in their pride and distemper, keeping them from an acquaintance with their own miserable condition. §. 72.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Person of Jesus Christ, and on what account He is the Sonne of God.

M. BIDDLE'S fourth Chapter Examined

Q. *HOW many Lords of Christians are there, by way of distinction from that one God?*

A. Eph 4.5.

Q. *Who is that one Lord?*

A 1 Cor.8.6.

Q. *How was Jesus Christ borne?*

A Mat.1.18.Luk.1.30,31,32,34,35

Q. *How came Jesus Christ to be Lord, according to the opinion of the Apostle Paul?*

A Rom.14.9.

Q. *What saith the Apostle Peter also concerning the time and manner of his being made Lord?*

A Act. 2.32,33,36.

Q. *Did not Jesus Christ approve himselfe to be God by his miracles? And did he not those Miracles by a* divine nature of his own, and because he was God himselfe? *What is the determination of the Apostle* Peter *in this behalfe?*

A Act.2.22.Act 10.38.

Q. *Could not Christ doe all things of himselfe? And was it not an Eternall Sonne of God that took flesh upon him, and to whom the humane nature of Christ was personally united, that wrought all his works? Answer me to these things in the words of the Sonne himselfe?*

A John 5.19,20,30. John 14.10.

Q. *What reason doth the Sonne render, why the* Father *did not forsake him, and cast him out of favour? Was it because he was of the same Essence with him, so that it was impossible for the Father to forsake him, or cease to love him?*

A John 8.28, 29, John 15 9,10.

Q. *Doth the Scripture avouch Christ to be the Sonne of God, because he was eternally begotten out of the divine Essence, or for other reasons agreeing to him only as a man? Rehearse the passages to this purpose.*

A Luke 1.30, 31, 32, 34, 35. John 10.36. Act. 13-32,33. Rev. 1.5. Col.1.18. Heb. 1.4,5. Heb. 5.5. Rom. 8.29.

Q. *What saith the Sonne himselfe concerning the prerogative of God the Father above him?*

A John 14.28. Mark.13.32. Math. 24.36.

Q. What saith the Apostle Paul?
A 1 Cor. 15. 24, 28. 1 Cor. 11. 3. 1 Cor. 3. 22, 23.
Q. Howbeit is not Christ dignified, as with the title of Lord, *so also with that of* God, *in the Scripture?*
A John 20. 28.
Q. Was he so the God of Thomas, as that he himselfe in the meane time did not acknowledge another to be his God?
A Joh. 20. 17. Revel. 3. 12.
Q. Have you any passage of the Scripture, where Christ, at the same time that he hath the appellation of God *given to him, is said to have a God?*
A Heb. 1 8, 9.

EXAMINATION.

THE aime and designe of our Catechist in this Chapter, being to despoile our blessed Lord Jesus Christ of his *Eternall Deity*, and to substitute an imaginary God-head, made, and feigned in the vaine hearts of himselfe & his Masters, into the roome thereof, I hope the discovery of the wickednesse and vanity of his attempt, will not be unacceptable to them, who *love him in sincerity*. I must still desire the Reader, not to expect the handling of the Doctrine of the Deity of Christ at large, with the confirmation of it, & vindication from the vaine Sophismes, wherewith by others, as well as by M. B. it hath been opposed. This is done abundantly by other hands. In the next chapters that also will have its proper place; in the vindication of many Texts of *Scripture* from the exceptions of the *Racovians*. The removall of M. B's Sophistry, & the disintangling of weaker soules, who may in any thing be intricated by his Queries, is my present intendment. To make our way cleare and plaine, that every one that runnes may read the vanity of M. B's undertaking against the Lord Jesus, and his *kicking against the pricks* therein, I desire to premise these few observations. §. 1.

1. Distinction of persons (it being in an *Infinite* substance) doth no way prove difference of Essence between the Father and the Sonne. Where Christ as Mediatour is said to be another from the Father, or God, spoken *personally* of the Father, it argues not in the least, that he is not partaker of the same nature with him. That in one Essence there can be but one person, may be true where the Substance is *Finite*, and limited, but hath no place in that which is *infinite*. §. 2.

2.

Τὴν ὑποταγὴν τῆς δουλικῆς μορφῆς ἀνειληφὼς, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὑποτασσεται τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πατρὶ, οὐ φύσει θέλητος, ἀλλ ἑνώσει μορφῆς δουλικῆς ἣν ἔλαβε *Athanas. dial. 1. contra Maced.*

2. Distinction and inequallity in respect of *office*, in Christ, doth not in the least take away Equallity and samenesse with the Father in respect of *nature* and Essence. A Sonne of the same nature with his Father, and therein equall to him, may in office be his inferiour, his Subject.

§. 4. 3. The advancement and exaltation of Christ, as Mediatour, to any dignity whatever, upon, or in reference to the worke of our Redemption and Salvation, is not at all inconsistent with that Essentiall ἀξία Honour, Dignity and Worth, which he hath in himselfe, as *God blessed for ever.* Though he humbled himselfe and was exalted, yet in nature he was one and the same, he changed not.

§. 5. 4. The Scriptures asserting the Humanity of Christ with the concernments thereof, as his *birth, life,* and *death,* doth no more therebydeny his Deity, then by asserting his Deity, with the Essentiall Propertyes thereof, Eternity, Omniscience, and the like, it denyes his Humanity.

§. 6. 5. God's working any thing in and by Christ as he was Mediatour, denotes the Fathers soveraigne *Appointment* of the things mentioned to be done, not his immediate *Efficiency* in the doing of the things themselves.

The consideration of these few things being added to what I have said before in generall, about the way of dealing with our Adversaries in these great and weighty things of the knowledge of God, will easily deliver us from any great trouble, in the Examination of M. B's Arguments, and insinuations against the Deity of Christ; which is the businesse of the present Chapter.

§. 7. His first Question is,

How many Lords of Christians are there by way of distinction from that one God. And he Answers Ephes. 4. 5. *One Lord.*

That of these two words there is not one that lookes towards the confirmation of what M. *Biddle* chiefely aymes at, in the Question proposed, is I presume sufficiently cleare in the light of the thing it selfe enquired after. Christ it is true, is the

the *one Lord* of Christians; and therefore God equall with the Father. He is also *one Lord*, in distinction from his Father, *as* his Father, in respect of his personallity; in which regard, there are *three that beare witnesse in Heaven*, of which he is one; but in respect of Essence and Nature *He and his Father are one*. Farther, unlesse he were one *God* with his Father, it is utterly impossible he should be the *one Lord* of Christians. That he cannnot be *our Lord* in the sence intended, whom we ought to invocate and worship, unlesse also he were *our God*, shall be afterwards declared. And although he be our Lord in distinction from his Father, as he is also our Mediatour, yet he is the same God with him, *which worketh all in all*, 1 *Cor.* 12 6. His being Lord then distinctly, in respect of his mediation, hinders not his being God, in respect of his participation in the same nature with his Father. And though here he be not spoken of in respect of his absolute soveraigne *Lordship*, but of his *Lordship* over the Church to whō the whole Church is spiritually subject, (as he is elsewere also so called on the same account, as *Joh.* 13-13. *Act.* 7.59. *Rev.* 22.20.) yet were he not Lord in that sence also, he could not be so in this. The *Lord* our *God* only is to be worshipped: *My Lord and my God*, says *Thomas*. And the mention of one God, is here, as in other places, partly to deprive all false Gods of their pretended Deity, partly to witnesse against the impossibillity of *Polytheisme*, and partly to manifest the oneneſſe of them who are worshipped as God, the Father, Word, and Spirit, all which things are also severally testifyed unto.

§. 8. His second Question is an enquiry after this Lord who he is, in these words, *Who is this Lord?* And the Answer is from 1 *Cor.* 8.6. *Jesus Christ by whom are all things*. The close of this second answer might have caused M. B. a little to recoyle upon his insinuation in the first, concerning the distinction of this *one Lord* from that *one God*, in the sence by him insisted on. Who is he by whom *are all things* (in the same sence as they are said to be of the Father) who is that God? *He that made all things is God*, *Heb.* 3.4. And it is manifest that he himselfe was not made, by whō all things were made. For he made not himselfe; nor could so do, unles he were both before & after himself; nor was he made without his own concurrence by another, for by himselfe are all things. Thus M. B. hath no sooner opened his mouth to speak against the Lord Jesus Christ, but by the just

Judgement of God, he stops it himselfe with a testimony of God against himselfe, which he shall never be able to rise up against unto Eternity.

Groti. Annot. in 1. Cor. 8. 6.

And it is a manifest perverting & corrupting of the Text which we have in *Grotius* his Glosse upon the place, who interprets the τὰ πάντα, referred to the Father, of all things simply, but the τὰ πάντα, referred to Christ, of the things only of the new Creation; There being not the least colour for any such variation, the frame and structure of the words requiring them to be expounded uniformely throughout. *But to us there is one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.* The last expression *and we by him*, relates to the new creation: *all things* to the first. But *Grotius* followes *Enjedinus*, in this as well as other things.

Enjedin: explicat. loc. vet. & nov Testam. in locum.

§. 9. His enquiry in the next place is after the *birth of Jesus Christ*, In answer whereunto the Story is reported from *Mathew* and *Luke*; which relating to his humane nature, and no otherwise to the person of the Sonne of God. but as he was therein made *flesh*, or assumed the *Holy Thing*, so borne of the Virgin, into personall subsistence with himselfe, I shall let passe, with annexing unto it the observation before mentioned, *viz.* That what is affirmed of the *Humane Nature* of Christ doth not at all prejudice that nature of his, in respect whereof he is said to be *in the beginning with God, and to be God*, and with reference whereunto himselfe said, *before Abraham was I am. God possessed him in the beginning of his ways*, being then his *only begotten Sonne*, full of Grace and Truth. M.B. indeed hath small hopes of dispoyling Christ of his Eternall Glory by his *Queries*, if they spend themselves in such fruitlesse sophistry as this.

Luk. 1. 35.

Joh. 1. 1, 2. Joh. 8. 57. Prov. 8. 22. &c.

§. 10. Qu. 4, 5. *How came Jesus Christ to be Lord according to the opinion of the Apostle Paul?* The Answer is Rom. 14. 19.

What saith Peter also concerning the time and manner of his being made Lord? Answer Acts 2. 32, 33, 36.

1. *R.* That Jesus Christ as Mediatour, and in respect of the worke of Redemption and Salvation of the Church, to him committed, was made Lord by the Appointment, Authority, and Designation of his Father, we do not say was the opinion *of Paul*, but is such a divine truth, as we have the plentifull Testimony

Testimony of the Holy Ghost unto. He was no lesse made a *Lord*, then a *Priest*, and *Prophet* of his Father; but that the Eternall Lordship of Christ, as he is one with his Father, *God blessed for ever more*, is any way denyed by the asserting of this Lordship given him of his Father as Mediatour, M. B. wholly beggs of men to apprehend & grant, but doth not once attempt from the Scripture to manifest or prove. The summe of what M. *Biddle* intends to Argue hence is, Christs submitting himselfe to the *forme* & worke of a *servant* unto the Father, was exalted by him, and had a *name given him above every name*, Therefore he was not the Sonne of God, and equall to him. That his condescention into Office, is inconsistent with his divine Essence, is yet to be proved. But may we not begge of our Catechist at his leisure to looke a little farther into the Chapter, from whence he takes his first Testimony, concerning the Exaltation of Christ to be Lord; perhaps it may be worth his while. As another Argument to that of the Dominion and Lordship of Christ, to perswade Believers to a mutuall forbearance, as to judging of one another, he addes *v.* 10. *We shall all stand before the Judgement seat of Christ*. And this *v.* 11. The Apostle proves from that Testimony of the Prophet *Isa.* 45. 23. as he renders the sense of the Holy Ghost. *As I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confesse to God*. So that Jesus Christ our Lord, is that *Iehovah, that God*, to whom all subjection is due, and in particular, that of standing before his Judgement Seat. but this is overlooked by *Grotius*, and not answered to any purpose by *Enjedinus*, and why should M. B. trouble himselfe with it. Rom. 9. 5.

2. For the time assigned by him of his being made *Lord*, specifyed by the Apostle, it doth not denote his *first* investiture with that Office and Power, but the solemne admission into the glorious execution of that *Lordly power*, which was given him as Mediatour. At his incarnation and Birth, God affirmes by the Angell, that he was then *Christ the Lord*, *Luke* 2. 11. And when *he brought his first begotten into the world, the Angels were commanded to worship him*, which, if he were not a *Lord*, I suppose M B. will not say they could have done. Yea, & as he was both believed in, & worshipped before his death and Resurrection, *Joh.* 9. 38. *John* 14. 1. which is to be per- §. 11.

formed only to the Lord our God, *Matth.* 4.10. so he actually in some measure exercised his Lordship towards, and over Angells, Men, Divels, and the residue of the Creation, as is known from the very story of the Gospell; not denying himselfe to be a King, yea witnessing thereunto when he was to be put to death. *Luk.* 23.3. *Ioh.* 18. 37. As he was from his first shewing unto men, *Ioh.* 1.49.

§. 12. Q. 6. *Did not Iesus approve himselfe to be God by his miracles? And did he not these miracles by a divine nature of his own, and because he was God of himselfe, what is the determination of the Apostle Peter in this behalfe?* Ans. Act. 2.22. Act. 10. 38.

The intendment of M. *Biddle* in this Question, as is evident by his inserting of these words in a different Character [*by a divine nature of his own, and because he was God himselfe,*] is to disprove, or insinuate an answer unto the Argument, taken from the Miracles that Christ did, to confirme his Deity. The naked working of Miracles, I confesse, without the influence of such other Considerations, as this Argument is attended withall, in relation to Jesus Christ, will not alone of it selfe assert a divine nature in him, who is the instrument of their working or production. Though they are from divine power, or they are not *miracles*, yet it is not necessary, that he by whō they are wrought, should be possessour of that divine Power, as *by whom* may denote the instrumentall, and not the principall cause of them. But for the Miracles wrought by Jesus Christ, as God is said to do them *by him*, because he appointed him to doe them, as he designed him to his offices, and thereby gave Testimony to the Truth of the Doctrine he preached from his bosome, as also because he was with him, not in respect of power and virtue, but as the Father in the Sonne, *Ioh.* 10. 38. So he working these miracles by his own power, and at his own will, even as his Father doth, *Ioh.* 5. 21. and himselfe giving power and Authority to others to worke miracles by his strength, and in his name, *Mat.* 10. 8 *Mark.* 16. 17, 18. *Luk.* 10.19. There is that eminent evidence of his Deity in his working of miracles, as M. B. can by no meanes darken or obscure, by pointing to that which is of a cleare consistency therewithall: as is his Fathers appointment of him to do them whereby he is said to do them in his name, &c. as in the place cited; of which afterwards.

Ad.

Act. 2.22. The intendment of *Peter* is to prove that he was the *Messias* of whom he spake; and therefore he calls him *Jesus of Nazareth*, as pointing out the man whom they knew by that name, and whom seven or eight weekes before they had crucifyed and rejected. That this man was* *approved of God*, He convinces them from the Miracles which God wrought by him: which was enough for his present purpose. Of the other place there is another reason. For though *Grotius* expound those words ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. For *God was with Him*, God alwayes loved him, and alwayes heard him, according to *Mat.* 3. 17. (where yet there is a peculiar Testimony given to the divine Sonship of Jesus Christ) and *Joh.* 11. 42. Yet the words of our Saviour himself, about the same business, give us another interpretation, and sence of them. This I say he does, *Joh.* 10. 37,38. *If I doe not the workes of my Father believe me not. But if I doe, though ye believe not me, believe the workes, that you may know and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.* In the doing of these workes, the Father was so with him, as that he was in Him, and He in the Father. Not only ἐνεργητικῶς, but by that divine Indwelling, which oneness of nature gives to Father and Sonne.

* Ἀποδεδειγμένον. i.e. οἷον μὴ ἀμφισβητούμενον, ἀλλ' ἀποδεδειγμένον διὰ πολλῶν ἔργων ἃ ἐποίησε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς, ὅτι ἦν μετὰ θεοῦ ἦν. *Grac. Schol.*

§. 13. His 7. Question is exceeding implicate and involved: a great deale is expressed that M. B. would deny, but by what inference from the Scriptures he produceth, doth not at all appeare, the words of it are, *Could not Christ do all things of himself, and was it not an Eternall Sonne of God that tooke flesh upon him, and to whom the humane nature of Christ was personally united, that wrought all these workes? Answer me to these things in the words of the Sonne himself.*

Ans. Joh. 5.19,20,30. Joh. 14.10.

The Inference which alone appeares from hence, is of the same nature with them that are gone before. That Christ could not do all things of himself, that He was not the Eternall Sonne of God, that He tooke not flesh, is that which is asserted; but the proofe of all this doth disprove. Christ being accused by the Jewes, and persecuted for healing a man on the *Sabbath day*, and their rage being increased by his asserting his Equality with the Father (of which afterwards) *v.* 17, 18. He lets them know, that in the discharge of the office committed to Him, He

He did nothing but according to the Will, Commandement and appointment of his Father, with whom he is Equall, and doth of his *own Will* also the things that he doth; so that they had no more to plead against him, for doing what he did, then they had against him, whom they acknowledged to be God. Wherein he is so farre from declining the Assertion of his own Deity (which that he maintained, the Jewes apprehended, affirming, that he made himselfe equall with God, which none but God is, or can be, for between God, and that which is not God, there is no proportion, much lesse Equallity) as that he farther confirmes it, by affirming, that he *doth whatever the Father doth, and that as the Father quickneth whom he will, so He quickneth whom he will.* That redoubled assertion then of Christ, that he can do nothing of himselfe, is to be applied to the matter under consideration. He had not done, nor could do any worke, but such as his Father did also: It was impossible he should; Not only because he would not, in which sense τὸ ἀβούλητον is one kind of those things which are impossible, but also because of the oneneſse in Will, Nature, and power of himselfe, and his Father, which he asserts in many particulars. Nor doth he temper his speech as one that would ascribe all the honour to the Father, and so remove the charge that he made a man equall to the Father, as *Grotius* vainly imagines: for although as man he acknowledges his subjection to the Father, yea as Mediatour in the worke he had in hand, & his subordination to him as the Son, receiving all things from him by divine & Eternall communication, yet the Action or worke that gave occasion to that discourse, being an action of his person, wherein he was God, He all along asserts his own Equaility therein with the Father, as shall afterwards be more fully manifested.

Semper ea quæ de se prædicare cogitur, Christus ita temperat, ut omnem honorem referat ad patrem, & removeat illud crimen, quasi hominem patri æqualem faciat. Grotius Annot. in Joh. cap. 5. v. 30.

So that though in regard of his divine Personallity, as the Son, he hath all things from the Father, being *begotten* by him, and as Mediatour, doth all things by his appointment, and in his name, yet he in himselfe is still *one* with the Father, as to nature and Essence, *God to be blessed for ever more.* And that it was an Eternall Sonne of God that tooke flesh upon him, &c. hath M. B. never read, that in the *beginning was the word, and the word was God, and the Word was made flesh*: that *God was manifested in the flesh*, and that God sent forth his Sonne, *made of a woman, made under*

der the Law? Of which places afterward, in their vindication from the exception of his Masters.

His 8th Question is of the very same import with that going before, attempting to exclude Jesus Christ from the Unity of Essence with his Father, by his Obedience to him, and his Fathers Acceptation of him in the worke of Mediation; which being a most ridiculous begging of the thing in Question, as to what he pretends in the Query to be Argumentative, that I shall not farther insist upon it. §. 14.

Q. 9. We are come to the head of this Discourse, and of M. B's designe in this Chapter; and indeed of the greatest designe that he drives in Religion, *viz.* The denyall of the Eternall Deity of the Sonne of God, which not only in this place directly, but in sundry others covertly he doth invade and oppose. His Question is, *Doth the Scripture account Christ to be the Sonne of God, because he was Eternally begotten out of the divine Essence, or for other reasons agreeing to him only as a man? Rehearse the passages to this purpose.* §. 15.

His Answer is from Luk. 1, 31,32 34,35. John 10.36. Acts 13.32,33. Rev.1.5. Col.1.18. Heb.1-4,5. Heb. 5.5. Rom.8.29. most of which places are expresly contrary to him in his designe, as the progresse of our Discourse will discover. §. 16.

This I say being the head of the difference between us in this Chapter, after I have rectifyed one mistake in M. B's Question, I shall state the whole matter so as to obviate farther labour and trouble, about sundry other ensuing Queries. For M. B's Question then, we say not, that the Sonne is begotten Eternally *out of the divine Essence*, but *in* it, not by an Eternall act of the divine *Being*, but of the *Person* of the Father; which being premised I shall proceed.

The question that lyes before us is. §. 17.

Doth the Scripture account Christ to be the Sonne of God, because he was Eternally beggotten out of the Divine Essence, or for other Reasons agreeing to him only as a man? Rehearse the passages to this purpose.

The Reasons as farre as I can gather which M B. layes at the bottome of this appellation, are 1. His *birth* of the Virgin from *Joh.* 1. 30,31,32,33,34. 2. His *Mission*, or sending into the

the world by the Father, *Joh.* 10.36. 3. His *Resurrection* with power, *Act.* 13.32,33. *Rev.* 1.5. *Col.* 1.18. 4. His *Exaltation*, *Heb.* 5.5. *Rom.* 8.29.

For the removeal of all this, from prejudicing the eternall Sonship of Jesus Christ, there is an abundant sufficiency arising from the consideration of this one Argument. If Jesus Christ be called the Son of God, antecedently to his *Incarnation*, *Mission*, *Resurrection*, and *Exaltation*, then there is a reason and cause of that Appellation, before, and above all these Considerations; and it cannot be on any of these accounts that he is called the *Sonne of God*: but that he is so called antecedently to all these, I shall afterward abundantly manifest. Yet a little farther processe in this businesse, as to the particulars intimated, may not be unseasonable.

§. 18. 1. Then I shall propose the causes, on the account whereof alone these men affirme that Jesus Christ is called the *Sonne* of God. Of these the first and chiefest they insist upon is, His *Birth of the Virgin*: *viz.* that he was called the Sonne of God, because he was conceived of the Holy Ghost, this our *Catechist* in the first place proposes; And before him his Masters. So the *Racovians* in answer to that question.

Ergo dominus Jesus est purus homo?

Ans. *Nullo pacto* Etenim *est conceptus a Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine, eoque ab ipsa conceptione & ortu Filius Dei est, ut de ea re* Luk. 1.35. *legimus.*

"Is therefore the Lord Jesus a meere man?

Ans. "By no meanes, for he was conceived by the "Holy Ghost, borne of the Virgin, and therefore "from his Birth and Conception was the Sonne of "God, as we read in *Luk.* 1. 35. the place insisted on by the *Gentleman* we are dealing with all.

Catech. Racov. de Persona Christi Cap. 1.

Of the same mind are the residue of their Companions. So doe *Ostorodus* and *Voidovius* give an account of their Faith, in their *Compendium*, as they call it, of the *Doctrine of the Christian Church, flourishing now chiefely in Poland.* "They teach (say they)

Jesum Christum docent esse hominem illum, a spiritu Sancto conceptum, & natum ex beatâ Virgine, extra vel ante quem, nullum agnoscunt esse (aut) fuisse re ipsa existentem unigenitum Dei Filium. Porro hunc, Deum & Filium Dei unigenitum esse docent, tum ratione conceptionis, a Spiritu Sancto, &c. Compendiolum Doctrinæ Eccles. Christianæ &c. cap. 1.

"Jesus

" Jesus Christ to be that man, that was conceived of the Holy " Ghost, borne of the Virgin, besides and before whom they ac- " knowledge no only begotten Sonne of God truly existing. " Moreover they teach him to be God, and the only begotten " Sonne of God, by reason of his conception of the Holy " Ghost, &c. *Smalcius* hath written a whole booke of the *true Divinity of Jesus Christ*, wherein he hath gathered together whatever excellencys they will allow to be ascribed unto Him, making his Deity to be the exurgency of them all. Therefore is he God, & the son of God, because the things he there treates of, are ascribed unto him. Among these in his 3d Chap. which is of the *Conception and Nativity of Jesus Christ*, he gives this principall Account why he is called the *Sonne of God*, even from his *Conception* and *Nativity*. " He was (saith he) Conceived of the Holy " Ghost, and borne of the Virgin Mary, because of which man- " ner of Conception and Nativity, he was by the Angell called " the Sonne of God: And may so really be called the naturall " Sonne of God, because he was borne such: only Jesus Christ " was brought forth to light by God his Father, without the helpe of man.

Cõceptus enim est de Spiritu Sancto, & natus ex Virgine Maria. Ob id genus conceptionis & nativitatis modum Filius etiam Dei ab ipso Angelo vocatus fuit, & vita naturalis Dei Filius (quia scilicet talis natus fuit) dici vere potest. Solus Jesus Christus a Deo patre suo absq; opera viri in lumen productus est. Smal. de vera divinit. Jes. Christ. cap. 3.

§. 1.6

The great Master of the *Herd* himselfe, from whom indeed the rest do gleane, and gather almost all that they take so much paines to scatter about the world, gives continually this Reason of Christs being called the *Sonne of God*, and his *naturall Sonne*. " I say (saith he) that Christ is deservedly called " the Naturall Sonne of God, because he was borne " the Sonne of God, although he was not begotten of " the substance of God. And that He was borne the Sonne of " God another way, and not by generation of the Substance " of God, the words of the Angell prove, *Luk.* 1.35. Therefore

Dico igitur, Christum merito dici posse Filium Dei naturalem, quia natus est Dei Filius; tametsi ex ipsa Dei substantia non fuerit generatus. Natum autem illum sub alia ratione, quam per generationem ex ipsius Dei substantia probant Angeli verba, Maria matri ejus dicta Luk. 1. 35. *Quia igitur homo ille Jesus Nazarenus, qui dictus est Christus, non viri alicujus opera, sed Spiritus Sancti operatione generatus est in matris utero; propterea Filius Dei est vocatus.* Faust. Socin. Responsio. ad Weick. capit. 4. p. 202.

"because that man Jesus of Nazareth, who is called Christ, "was begotten not by the helpe of any man, but by the opera- "tion of the Holy Spirit in the womb of his Mother, he is "therefore, or for that cause, called the Sonne of God: So He against *Weick* the *Iesuite*. He is followed by *Volkelius*, (*Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 11. *P.* 468.) whose booke indeed is a meere casting into a kind of a method, what was written by *Socinus* and others, scattered in sundry particulars, and whose method is pursued and improved by *Episcopius*: *Ionas Schlictingius* amongst them all seemes to do most of himselfe, I shall therefore adde his Testimony, to shew their consent in the assignation of this cause of the Appellation of the *Sonne of God*, ascribed to our blessed Saviour. "There are (saith he) many sayings (of Scripture) "which shew, that Christ is in a peculiar manner, & on an ac- "count not common to any other, the Sonne of God; but "yet we may not hence conclude, that he is a Son on a naturall "account, when besides this, and that more common, another "reason may be given, which hath place in Christ. Is he not the "Sonne of God on a singular account, and that which is com- "mon to no other, if of God himselfe, by the virtue and effi- "cacy of the Holy Sprit, he was Conceived, and begotten in "the womb of his Mother?

Sunt quidem plurima dicta quæ ostendunt Christum, peculiari prorsus nec ulli alii communi ratione esse Dei Filium: non tamen hinc concludere licet eum esse naturali ratione filium: cum præter hanc, & illam communem, alia dari possit, & in Christo reipsa locum habeat. Nonne singulari prorsus ratione, nec ulli communi, Dei Filius est Christus, si ab ipso Deo, vi & efficacia Spiritus Sancti, in utero virginis conceptus fuit & genitus? Schlicting. ad Meisner. Artic. de Trinit. pag. 160.

§. 20. And this is the only Buckler which they have to keep off the sword of that Argument for the Deity of Christ, from his being the *proper Sonne of God*, from the throat, and heart of that cause which they have undertaken. And yet how faintly they hold it, is evident from the expressions of this most cunning and Skilful of all their *Champions*. *There MAY another reason be given.* Which is the general Evasion of them all, from any expresse Testimony of Scripture. The *words MAY* have another sence, therefore nothing from them can be concluded; whereby they have left nothing stable, or unshaken in Christian Religion; and yet *wipe their mouths*, and say they have done *no evill.*

But

But now least any one should say, that they can see no reason why Christ should be called the Sonne of God, because he was so conceived by the Holy Ghost, nor wherefore God should therefore in a peculiar manner, and more eminently, then in respect of any other, be called the Father of Christ, to prevent any objection that on this hand might arise, *Smalcius* gives an account whence this is, & why God is called the *Father of Christ*, and what he did in his Conception; which, for the Abomination of it, I had rather you should heare in his words then in mine. In his answer to the second part of the refutation of *Socinus* by *Smiglecius*, *cap.* 17, 18. he contends to manifest, and make good, that Christ was the *Sonne of God according to the flesh*, in direct opposition to that of the Apostle, *He was of the seed of David according to the flesh, declared to be the Sonne of God, &c. Rom.* 1. 3, 4. He sayes then *cap.* 18. *p.* 156. *Socinus affirmat Deum in generatione Christi vices patris suppleviſſe.* ------- but how I pray? why! *Satis est ad ostendendum, Deum in generatione Christi vices viri suppleviſſe, si ostendatur, Deum id ad Christi generationem adjeciſſe, quod in generatione hominis ex parte viri, ad hominem producendum adjeci solet*: but what is that, or how is that done? *Nos Dei virtutem in Virginis uterum aliquam substantiam creatam vel immiſiſſe, aut ibi creaſſe affirmamus, ex qua junctio eo, quod ex ipsius Virginis substantia acceſſit, verus homo generatus fuit. Alias enim homo ille, Dei Filius a conceptione & nativitate proprie non fuiſſet. cap.* 17. *pag.* 150. Very good, unless this abominable figment may passe current, Christ was not the Sonne of God. Let the Reader observe by the way, that they cannot but acknowledg Christ to have been, and to have been called the *Sonne of God* in a most peculiar manner: To avoid the evidence of the inference from thence, that therefore he is God, of the same substance with his Father, They only have this *shift*, to say he is called the *Son of God*, upon the account of that, whereof there is not the least tittle, nor word in the whole booke of God; yea which is expressly contrary to the Testimony thereof; & unless this be granted they affirme that Christ cannot be called the Son of God. But let us heare this great *Rabbi* of M. E's *religion* a little farther *clearing* up this *mistery*. *Necessitas magna fuit, ut Christus ab initio vitæ suæ esset Deo Filius, qualis futurus non fuiſſet nisi Dei virtute aliquid creati fuiſſet, quod ad constituendum Christi corpus, una cum Mariæ Sanguine concurrit. Man-* §. 21.

sit autem nihilominus sanguis Mariæ Virginis purissimus, etiamsi cum alio aliquo semine commixtus fuit. Potuit enim tam purum, imo purius semen, a Deo creari, & proculdubio creatum fuit, quam erat sanguis Mariæ. Communis denique sensus, & fides Christianorum omnium, quod Christus non ex virili semine conceptus sit; primum, communis error censendus est, si sacris literis repugnet: Deinde id quod omnes sentiunt, facile cum ipsa veritate conciliari potest, ut scilicet semen illud, quod a Deo creatum, & cum semine Mariæ conjunctum fuit, dicatur non virile, quia non a viro profectum sit, vel ex viro in uterum Virginis translatum, ut quidam opinantur, qui semen Josephi translatum in Virginis uterum credunt. cap. 18. pag. 158. And thus farre are men arrived. Unlesse this horrible *figment* may be admitted, Christ is not the Sonne of God. He who is the *true God and eternall Life*, will one day plead the cause of his own glory against these men.

§. 22. I insist somewat the more on these things, that men may judge the *better*, whether in all probability M. *Biddle* in his *impartiall* search into the Scripture, did not use the helpe of some of them that went before him, in the discovery of the same things, which He *boasts* Himselfe to have found out.

§. 23. And this is the first reason which our *Catechist* hath taken from his *Masters*, to communicate to his *Schollers*, why Jesus Christ is called the Sonne of God. This He and they insist on, exclusively to his *Eternall Sonship*, or being the Sonne of God in respect of his *Eternall generation* of the substance of his Father.

§. 24. The other causes which they assigne, why he is called the Sonne of God, I shall very briefely point unto. By the way that hath been spoken of, they say he was the Sonne of God; the naturall Sonne of God. But they say he was the Sonne of God, before he was God. He grew afterward to be a God by degrees as he had those Graces, and excellencyes, and that power given him, wherein his God-head doth consist. So that He was the *Sonne* of God, but not God (in their own sence) untill a while after. And then when he was so made a God, He came thereby to be more the Sonne of God. But by this addition to his Sonship he became the adopted Sonne of God: as by being begotten, as was before revealed, he was the naturall Son of God. Let us heare *Smalcius* a little opening these

mysteries.

misteries; "Neither (saith he) was Christ God, all the while "He was the Sonne of God. To be the Sonne of God, is refer'd "to his birth, and all understand how one may be call'd the "Sonne of God, for his birth or originall But God none can "be (besides that one God) but for his likenesse to God. So "that when Christ was made like God, by the divine Qualities "which were in him, he was most rightly so farre the Sonne of "God, as he was God, and so farre God, as he was the Sonne of "God. But before he had obtained that likenesse to God, pro-"perly he could not be said to be God.

Nec enim omni tempore quo Christus Filius Dei fuit, Deus etiã fuit. Filiũ enim Dei esse, ad nativitatem etiam referri, & ob ortum ipsum aliquem Dei Filium appellari posse nemo non intelligit. At deum (præter unum illum deum) nemo esse potest, nisi propter similitudinem cum deo. Itaque tunc cum Christus deo similis factus esset per divinas quæ in ipso erant qualitates, summo jure eatenus dei Filius, qua deus, & vicissim eatenus deus, qua dei Filius: Ante obtentam illam cum deo similitudinem deus propriè dici non potuit. Smal: Respon. ad Smiglec. Cap: 17. p: 154.

§. 25. And these are some of those monstrous figments which under pretence of *bare adherence* to the Scripture, our *Catechist* would obtrude upon us. First Christ is the Sonne of God. Then growing like God in divine Qualities, he is made a God, and so becomes more the Sonne of God. And this, if the man may be believed, is the pure Doctrine of the Scripture. And if Christ be a God, because he is like God, by the same reason we are all Gods in M. B's conceit, being all made in the Image and likeneſse of God, which (sayes he) by sinne we have not lost.

§. 26. But what kind of Sonship is added to Christ by all these excellencyes, whereby he is made like to God? The same author tells us, that it is a *Sonship by adoption*, and that Christ on these accounts was the *adopted Sonne of God.* "If (saith he) what is "the signification of this word [*adoptivus*] may be considered "from the Scripture, we deny not but that Christ in this man-"ner may be called the adopted Sonne of God. Seeing that "such is the property and conditition of an adopted Sonne

Si quæ sit vocabuli Adoptivus *significatio ex mente sacrarum literarum consideretur, nos non inficiari Christum suo modo esse adoptivum dei Filium. Quia enim adoptivi Filii ea est conditio & proprietas, ut talis non sit natus qualis factus est post adoptionem; certe quia Christus talis natura, vel in ipsa conceptione & nativitate non fuit, qualis postea fuit, gratiæ accedente, sine injuria* adoptivus *dei Filius eo modo dici potest.* Smalci. ad Smiglec. c. 20 p. 175.

that

"that he is not borne such as he is afterward made by adopti-
"on; certainely seeing that Christ was not such by nature, or
"in his conception and nativity as he was afterward in hs suc-
"ceeding age, he may justly on that account be called the a-
"dopted Son of God. Such miserable plunges doth Sathan drive men into, whose *eyes he hath once blinded*, that the glorious light of the Gospell should not shine into them. And by this we may understand whatever they adde farther concerning the Sonship of Christ: That all belongs to this *Adoptive Sonship*, whereof there is not one tittle in the whole booke of God.

§. 25. The reasons they commonly adde, why in this sence Christ is called the Sonne of God, are the same which they give, why He is called God. "He is the only begotten Sonne of God, (say the Authors of the *Compendium* of the Religion before mentioned) "becaus God Sanctifyed him, and sent Him into the "world, and becaus of his exaltation at the right hand of God, "whereby he was made our Lord and God.

Filium Dei unigenitum esse docent, tum propter Sanctificationem, ac missionem in mundum, tum exaltationem ad dei dextram; adeo ut factum dominum & deum nostrum affirmant, Compendi. Relig. cap. 1. pag. 2.

§. 26. If the Reader desire to heare them speak in their own words, let him consult *Smalcius de vera Divinit. Jes. Christ. cap. 7. &c. Socin. Disput. cum Erasmo Johan. Rationum quatuor antecedent. Refut. Disput. de Christi natura pag.* 14,15. *Adversus Weickum p.* 224, 245. *& passim. Volkel. de vera Religi. lib.* 5. *cap.* 10,11,12. *Jonas Schlicht. ad Meisner. p.* 192,193. *&c.* Especially the same person, fully and distinctly opening and declaring the *minds* of his Companions, and the severall accounts on which they affirme Christ to be, and to have been called the Sonne of God, in his *Comment* on the Epistle to the *Hebrewes p.* 16,17,18,19, 20. as also his notes upon *Vechnerus* his *Sermon* on *Joh.* 1. *pag.* 14. *&c. Anonym. Respon. ad centum argumenta Gichorii Jesuitæ pag.* 8, 9. 10. *Confessio Fidei Christianæ, edita nomine Ecclesiarum in Polonia. pag.* 24, 25.

Their good friend *Episcopius* hath ordered all their causes of Christs *Filiation* under foure heads.

"The

"The first way (saith he) whereby Christ is in the Scriptures "κατ' ἐξοχὴν called the Sonne of God, is in that as man he was "conceived of the Holy Ghost and borne of a Virgin. And I "doubt not (saith he) but that God is on this ground called emi- "nently the Father of our Lord Christ.

2. "Jesus Christ by reason of that Duty or office which "was imposed on him by his Father, that he should be the "King of Israel promised by the Propher, is called the Sonne "of God.

3. "Because he was raised up by the Father to an immor- "tall life, and as it were borne againe from the wombe of "the Earth, without the helpe of any Mother.

4. "Because being so raised from death, he is made com- "pleate heire of his Fathers house, & Lord of all his Heavenly "goods, Saints, and Angels. The like he had written before in his *Apology* for the *Remonstrants cap.* 2. *Sect.* 2.

Primus modus est, quia ut a- tenus homo ex Spiritu dei Sancto conceptus est, & ex Virgine natus est: nec dubium mihi est, quin ob hunc modū, deus etiam κατ' ἐξοχὴν vocetur Pater domini nostri Jesu Christi. Secundus modus est, quia Iesus Christus ratione muneris illius, quod a patre speciali prævisus ante mandato impositum ei fuit, ut Rex Israelis esset, promissus ille per Prophetas, & secula Filius dei vocatur. Tertius modus est, quia a patre ex mortuis in vitam immortalem suscitatus, & veluti ex utero terræ, nullo mediante matre, denuo genitus est. Quartus modus est, quia Iesus Christus ex morte suscitatus, hæres ex asse constitutus est in domo patris sui, ac proinde bonorum omnium cælestium, & patris sui ministrorum omnium sive Angelorum dominus. Episcop. Institu. Theolog. lib. 4. cap. 33. S. 2. p. 195.

§. 28.

Thus He, evidently and plainely from the *Persons* before named. But yet after all this, he askes another Question, whether all this being granted, there do not yet moreover remaine a more eminent and peculiar reason, why Christ is called the Sonne of God. He answers himselfe: there is, namely, his *Eternall Generation* of the Father; His being *God* of *God* from all Eternity, which he pursues with sundry Arguments; And yet in the close disputes, that the acknowledgement of this Truth is not *Fundamentall*, or the denyall of it exclusive of Salvation. So this great reconciler of the *Arminian* and *Socinian* Religions, whose composition and unity, into an opposition to them whom he calls *Calvinists*, is the great designe of his *Theologicall institutions*, and such at this day is the ayme of *Curcellæus*, & some others. By the way I shall desire, (before I answer what he offers to confirme his Assignation of this *foure fold* manner of *Filiation* to Jesus Christ) to aske this learned *Gentleman* (or those

Insti. Theol. lib. 4. Sect. 2. c. 33. p. 335.

these of his mind who do survive him) this one Question seeing that Jesus Christ was from eternity the Son of God, and is called so after his Incarnation, and was on that account in his whole person the Sonne of God, by their own confessions, what tittle he or they can find in the Scripture of a *manifold Filiation* of Jesus Christ, in respect of God his Father, or whether it be not a diminution of his glory, to be called the *Sonne of God* upon any lower account, as by a new addition to him, who was *eternally* his only begotten Sonne, by vertue of his *Eternall Generation* of his own substance?

§. 29. Having thus discovered the minde of them with whom we have to doe, and from whom our *Catechist* hath borrowed his *discoveries*, I shall briefely do these two things.

1. Shew that the *Filiation* of Christ consists in his generation of the substance of his Father from Eternity; or that he is the *Sonne of God* upon the account of his *Divine Nature*, and subsistence therein, antecedent to his Incarnation.

2. That it consists *solely* therein, and that he was not, nor was called the *Sonne of God* upon any other account, but that mentioned; and therein answer what by M. B. or others is objected to the contrary.

3. To which I shall adde Testimonies & Arguments for the Deity of Christ, whose opposition is the maine businesse of that *new* Religion, which M. *Biddle* would Catechise poore unstable soules into, in the vindication of those excepted against by the *Racovians*.

§. 30. For the demonstration of the first Assertion, I shall insist on some few of the Testimonies and Arguments, that might be produced for the same purpose.

§. 31. 1. He who is the *True, Proper, only begotten Sonne of God, of the Living God*, He is begotten of the *Essence of God* his Father, and is his Sonne by vertue of that Generation. But Jesus Christ was thus the *only, true, proper, only begotten Sonne of God*: and therefore is the Son of God upon the account before mentioned: That Jesus Christ is the Sonne of God in the manner expressed, the Scripture abundantly testifieth. *Lo a voyce from Heaven, saying, this is my beloved Sonne in whom, I am well pleased, Math.* 3. 17. Thou art Christ the *Sonne of the Living God, Math.* 16. 16. & *John* 6. 69.

Which

Which place in *Mathew* is the rather remarkable, because it is the Confession of the Faith of the Apostle, given in in answer to that question, *who do you say that I the Sonne of man am?* They answer, the *Sonne of the Living God.* And this in opposition to them, who said he was a *Prophet*, or as *one of the Prophets*, as *Marke* expresses it, *cap.* 6.15. that is, only so. And the whole *Confession* manifests, that they did in it acknowledge both his *Office* of being the Mediatour, and his *divine nature*, or person also. Thou *art the Christ*, those words comprize all the causes of *Filiation*, insisted on by them with whom we have to doe, and the whole office of the *Mediation* of Christ, but yet hereunto they adde, the *Sonne of the Living God:* expressing his divine nature, and *Sonship* on that account. §. 32.

And we know that the *Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding*, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his *Son Iesus Christ, this is the true God, & eternall Life*, *Ioh.* 5.20. He spared not *his own Sonne*, *Rom* 8.32. And the *word was made flesh*, and dwelt amongst us, and we saw his Glory, the Glory as of the *only begotten Sonne of God. Ioh.* 1.14. No man hath seen God at any time, the *only begotten Sonne*, who is in the bosome of the Father, he hath revealed him, *v.*18. --- Said also, *That God was his Father making himselfe equall with God* 1 *Ioh.* 5.18. So God loved the world, that he gave *his only begotten Sonne*, *Ioh.* 3.16. *In this was manifest the Love of God*, that he sent his *only begotten Sonne* into the world, 1 *Ioh.* 4.9. *Thou art my Sonne this day have I begotten thee*, *Psal.* 2.7. *&c.* All which places will be afterwards vindicated at large. §. 33.

To prove the inference laid down, I shall fix on one or two of these instances. §. 34.

1. He who is ἴδιος υἱὸς, the *proper Sonne* of any, is begotten of the substance of his Father: Christ is the proper Sonne of God: and God he called often ἴδιον πατέρα his *proper Father*. He is *properly* a Father, who begets another of his substance, and he is *properly* a Son, who is so begotten.

Grotius confesseth there is an *emphasis* in the word ἴδιος, whereby Christ is distinguished from that kind of *Sonship*, which the Jewes laid claime unto. Now the Sonship they laid claime unto, and enjoyed so many of them, as were truly so, was by *Adoption*. For to them *pertained the Adoption*, *Rom.*9.4. §. 35. Grot. Annot. Joh. 18.

wherein this *emphasis* then, & specially of Christs *Sonship* should consist, but in what we assert of his naturall Sonship, cannot be made to appeare. *Grotius* says it is, because the *Son of God* was a *name of the Messiah*. True, but on what account? Not that common of *Adoption*, but this of *Nature*, as shall afterwards appeare.

§. 36. Againe, he who is *properly* a Sonne, is distinguished from him who is *metaphorically* so only. For any thing what ever is *metaphorically* said to be, what it is said to be, by a *Translation*, and likenesse to that which is true. Now if Christ be not begotten of the Essence of his Father, he is only a *metaphoricall* Sonne of God, by way of Allusion, and cannot be called the *proper* Sonne of God, being only one who hath but a *similitude* to a *proper* Sonne. So that it is a plaine contradiction, that Christ should be the *proper* Sonne of God, and yet not be *begotten* of his Fathers Essence. Besides, in that 8th of the *Romans*, the Apostle had before mentioned other *Sonnes of God*, who became so by *Adoption*, *v.* 15, 16. but when he comes to speake of Christ, in opposition to them, he calls Him *Gods own*, *or proper Sonne*, that is, his *naturall Sonne*, they being so only by *Adoption*. And in the very words themselves, the distance that is given him by way of *Eminence* above all other things, doth sufficiently evince in what sence he is called the proper Sonne of God. *He that spared not his own Son, how shall he not with him give us all things?*

§. 37. 2. The *only begotten Sonne of God*, is his *naturall* Sonne, begotten of his Essence, and there is noe other Reason of this Appellation. And this is farther cleare from the *Antithesis*, of this *only begotten*, to *adopted*: They are *Adopted* Sons who are received to be such by *grace* and favour. He *is only begotten*, who alone *is begotten* of the substance of his Father. Neither can any other *reason* be assigned, why Christ should so constantly, in way of distinction from all others, be called the *only begotten* Sonne of God. It were even ridiculous to say, that Christ were the *only begotten* Sonne of God, and *his proper* Sonne, if He were His Sonne only *metaphorically* and *improperly*. That *Christ* is the *proper*, *only begotten Sonne* of God, *improperly* and *metaphorically*, is that which is asserted to evade these Testimonies of Scripture. Adde hereunto, the *Emphaticall* discriminating significancy of that voice from Heaven, *this is He, that well beloved Sonne of mine*; and that Testimony which in the same manner *Peter* gave

to

to this sonship of Christ in his Confession, *thou art the Sonne of the Living God*, and the ground of Christs *Filiation* will be yet more evident. Why the *Sonne of the living God*, unlesse as begotten of God, as the living God, as living things beget of their own substance? but of that place before. Christ then, being the *true, proper, beloved, only begotten Sonne of the living God*, is his Naturall Sonne, of his own substance and Essence.

§. 38. 2. The same Truth may have farther evidence given unto it, from the consideration of what *kind* of *Sonne* of God Jesus Christ is. He who is *such* a Sonne as is *equall* to his Father in Essence and properties; He is a *Sonne begotten of the Essence of his Father*. Nothing can give such an *Equality*, but a *Communication* of Essence. Then, with God Equality of *Essence* can alone give Equality of Dignity, and Honour. For between that Dignity, Power, and Honour, which belongs to God, as God, and that Dignity or Honour, that is, or may be given to any other, there is no proportion, much lesse Equality, as shall be evidenced at large afterwards. And this is the sole Reason, why a Sonne is *equall* to his Father in *Essence* and *Properties*, because he hath from him a Communication of the *same* Essence, whereof He is partaker. Now that Christ is such a Sonne, as hath been mentioned, the Scripture abundantly testifies. *My Father* (saith Christ) *worketh hitherto, and I worke: therefore the Jewes sought the more to kill him, not only because he had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himselfe equall with God, Joh.* 5. 17, 18. *v.* 17. having called God his Father, in the particular manner before mentioned, and affirmed to himselfe an *equall nature, and power* for operation with his Father, the *Iewes* thence inferre, that he testifyed of himselfe, that he was such a *Sonne of God*, as that he was *equall* with God.

The full *opening* of this place at large is not my present businesse. The *Learned* Readers know where to find that done to their hand. The intendment of those *words* is plaine & evident. *Grotius* expounds ἴσον ἑαυτὸν τῷ θεῷ: by, *it was lawfull for him to do what was so to God, and that he was no more bound to the Sabbath then he*. Which (saith he) *was a grosse calumny*. So *v.* 19. * those words of our Savi-

§. 36. *Sibi licere prædicans quicquid deo licet; neque magis Sabbato adstringi. Crassa Calumnia.* Grot. Annot. Joh. 5. 18. * *Comparatio est sumpta a discipulo sibi qui magistrum præeuntem diligenter imitatur, ut imitari posset.*

our; *The Sonne can doe nothing of himselfe, but what he sees the Father do* (wherein the *emphasis* lyes evidently in the words ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, for the Sonne can do nothing of *himselfe*, but what the Father doth, seeing he hath his *Essence*, and so consequently *will*, and *Power* communicated to him by the Father) He renders to be an Allusion to, and comparison between a *Master and* Schollar: as *the schollar lookes diligently to what his master doth, and strives to imitate him*; *so was it with Christ and God*; which exposition was the very same with that which the *Arians* assigned to this place, as *Maldonat* upon the place makes appeare. That it is not an *equall licence* with the Father, to worke on the Sabbath, but an Equallity of Essence, Nature, and Power between Father and Sonne, that the Jewes concluded from the saying of Christ, is evident on this consideration; that there was no strength in that plea of our Saviour, of working on the *Sabbath day*, because his Father did so, without the violation of the Sabbath, unlesse there had been an *Equallity* between the *Persons* working. That the *Iewes* did herein *calumniate* Christ, or accused him *falsely*, the *Tritheits* said indeed, as *Zanchius* testifyes; and *Socinus* is of the same mind; whose *Interest Grotius* chiefely serves in his *Annotations*. But the whole context and carriage of the businesse, with the whole Reply of our Saviour, doe abundanly manifest, that the *Iewes*, as to their collection, were in the Right, that he made himselfe such a *Sonne of God*, as was *equall to him*.

Zanchius de Tribus Elohim. lib. 5. cap. 4. p. 151.

§. 40. For if in this conclusion they had been *mistaken*, & so had calumniated Christ; There be two grand causes, why He should have delivered them from that mistake, by expounding to them what manner of Son of God He was. First, because of the just *scandall* they might take at what he had spoken, apprehending that to be the *sence* of his words, which they professed. Secondly, because on that account they sought to *slay him*, which if they had done, He should by his death have borne witnesse to that which was not true. *They sought to kill Him*, because He made Himselfe such a Sonne of God, as by that sonship He was *equall* to God; which if it were not so, there was

Notemus igitur Christum Judæos tanquã in verborũ suorũ intelligentia hallucinatos minime reprehendentẽ se naturalẽ Dei Filiũ clare professum esse. Deinde, quod isto modo colligunt Christum se Deo æqualem facere recte fecerunt; nec ideo a Christo refelluntur, aut vituperantur ab evangelista, qui in re tanta nos errare non fuit passus. Cartwrightus Har. evan. in Loc.

a neceſſity incumbent on him, to have cleared himſelfe of that aſperſion: which yet he is ſo farre from, as that in the following verſes, he farther confirmes the ſame thing.

§. 41. So he thought it not *Robbery to be equall with God, Phil.* 2. 6. It is of God the Father that this is ſpoken, as the Father; as it appeares in the winding up of that Diſcourſe, *v.* 11. *That every tongue ſhould confeſſe, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* And to him is Chriſt *equall*, and therefore begotten of his own Eſſence.

§. 42. Yea he is ſuch a Son as is *one* with his Father. I *and my Father are one. Joh.* 10.30 Which the *Iewes* again inſtantly interpret without the leaſt reproofe from him, that he being man, did yet aver himſelfe to be God, *v.* 33.

§. 43. This place alſo is attempted to be taken out of our hands by *Grotius*, though with no better ſucceſſe then the former. Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμεν. *He joyneth what he had ſpoken, with what went before:* (ſaith he) *if they cannot be taken from my Fathers power, they cannot be taken from mine; For I have my power of my Father, ſo that it is all one to be kept of me, as of my Father:* which he intends (as I ſuppoſe) to illuſtrate by the example of the power that *Joſeph* had under *Pharoah, Gen.* 41. though the *verſe* he intend be falſe printed. But that it is an Unity of *Eſſence*, and *Nature*, as well as an a like *Prevalency* of power that our Saviour intends, not only from that apprehenſion which the Jewes had concerning the ſence of thoſe words, who immediately tooke up ſtones to kill him for *blaſphemy*, from which apprehenſion he doth not at all labour to free them, but alſo from the expoſition of his mind in theſe words, which is given us in our Saviours following diſcourſe. For *v.* 16. He tels us, this is as much as if he had ſaid, *I am the Sonne of God.* Now the unity between *Father* and *Sonne*, is in *Eſſence*, and *Nature* principally: & then that he *doth the workes of the Father*, the ſame workes that his Father doth, *v.* 37, 38. which were he not of the ſame *nature* with him he could not doe: which he cloſes with this, *that the Father is in him, and he in the Father, v.* 38. of which words before, and afterwards.

Connectit quod dixerat cum ſuperioribus. Si à patris Poteſtati eripi non poterunt, nec mea poterunt. Nam poteſtas mea patre emanat, & quidem ita, ut tantundem valeat a me aut a patre coſtodiri. vid. Gen. 41. 25, 27.

§. 44. He then (that we may proceed) who is ſo the Sonne of God, as that he is *one* with God, and therefore God, is the Naturall and Eternall Sonne of God; but that ſuch a Sonne is Jeſus Chriſt

Christ, is thus plentifully testifyed unto, in the Scripture. But because I shall insist on sundry other places to prove the Deity of Christ, which also all confirme the Truth under demonstration, I shall here passe them by. The evidences of this Truth from scripture do so abound, that I shall but only mention some other heads of Arguments, that may be, and are commonly insisted on to this purpose. Then

§. 45. 3. He who is the *Sonne of God*, begotten of his Father, by an *Eternall communication of his divine Essence*, He is the Sonne begotten of the Essence of the Father. For these termes are the same, and of the same importance. But this is the description of Christ as to his *Sonship*, which the Holy Ghost gives us. *Begotten* he was of the Father according to his own Testimony; *Thou art my Sonne this day have I begotten thee, Psal. 2. 7.* And he is the only *begotten Son of God, Joh. 1. 14.* And that he is so begotten by a communication of Essence, we have His own Testimony, *when there were no hills I was brought forth, Prov. 8. 28.* He was begotten and brought forth from *Eternity*. And how He tells you farther. *Ioh. 5. 26. The Father hath given unto the Son to have life in himselfe.* It was by the Fathers Communication of *life* unto him, and His living Essence or Substance; for the *Life* that is in God, differs not from his *being*: And all this from Eternity. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his workes of old; I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was, when there were no depths I was brought forth, when there were no fountaines abounding with water: before the Mountaines were setled, before the Hills were brought forth, &c.* Prov. 8. 22. &c. to the end of *v. 32. And thou Bethlehem-Ephratah, --- out of thee shall come forth unto me, he that is to be Ruler in Israel: whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.* Mich. 5. 2. *In the beginning was the Word* Joh. 1. 1. *And now O Father, glorify thou me with thine own selfe, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,* Joh. 17. 5. *And againe, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world he saith, &c.* Heb. 1. 6. *&c.*

§. 46. 4. The farther description which we have given us of this *Sonne*, makes it yet more evident. He is the *brightnesse of his Fathers Glory, and the expresse image of his person.* Heb. 1. 3. *The image of the invisible God.* Col. 1. 15. That Christ is the *Essentiall* Image of his Father, & not an *accidentall Image*; an *Image* so as no Creature is,

is, or can be admitted into copartnership with him therein, shall be on another occasion in this Treatise fully demonstrated. And thither the vindication of those Texts from the glosse of *Grotius* is also remitted.

And this may suffice (without insisting upon what more might be added) for the demonstration of the first Assertion; that Christs *Filiation* ariseth from his eternall Generation; or He is the Sonne of God, upon the account of his being begotten of the Essence of his Father from Eternity. §. 47.

2. That he is, and is termed the Sonne of God, *solely* on this account, and not upon the Reasons mentioned by M. B. and explained from his companions, is with equall cleareness evinced: nay I see not how any thing may seeme necessary for this purpose to be added to what hath been spoken; but for the farther satisfaction of them who oppose themselves, the ensuing considerations, through the Grace and patience of God, may be of use. §. 48.

1. If for the Reasons and causes above insisted on from the *Socinians*, Christ be the Sonne of God, then Christ is the Sonne of God *according to the flesh*, or according to his *humane nature*. So he must needs be, if God be called his Father, because he *supplyed the roome* of a Father in his conception. But this is directly contrary to the Scripture: calling Him the Son of God in respect of his divine nature, in opposition to the Flesh, or his Humane nature, &c. *Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with Power*, Rom. 1. 2, 3. *Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever*, Rom. 9. 5. The same distinction and opposition is observed, 2 *Cor.* 13. 4. 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. If Jesus Christ according to the *flesh* be the Sonne of *David*, in Contradistinction to the Sonne of God, then doubtlesse he is not called the Sonne of God according to the flesh: but this is the plaine assertion of the Scripture in the places before named. Besides, on the same reason that Christ is the *Sonne* of man, on the same He is not the Sonne of God. But Christ was, and was called the *Sonne* of man, upon the account of his Conception of the substance of his Mother, and particularly the Sonne of *David*; and so is not on that account the Sonne of God. §. 49.

Farther,

§. 50. Farther, That place of *Rom.* 1. 3,4. passing not without some *Exceptions*, as to the sence insisted on, may be farther cleared, and vindicated. Jesus Christ is called the Sonne of God, *v.* 1, 3. *The Gospell of God, concerning his Sonne Iesus Christ*: This Sonne is farther described, 1. by his *humane Nature*, *He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.* 2. In respect of his person or divine nature, wherein he was the Sonne of God, and that ἐν δυνάμει, in power or *existing in the power of God*: For so δύναμις put absolutely doth often signify; as *Rom.* 1. 20. *Math.* 6. 13. and *chap.* 26. 64. *Luk.* 4. 36. He *had*, or *was*, in the *omnipotency* of God: and was this declared to be, not in respect of the *flesh*, in which he was made of a *woman*, but, κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης (which is opposed to κατὰ σάρκα) according to, or in respect of his divine *Holy Spirit*: as is also the intendment of that word the *Spirit*, in the places above mentioned. Neither is it new, that the Deity of Christ should be called πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης. Himselfe is called קדש קדשים *Dan.* 9. 24. *sanctitas sanctitatum*: as here *spiritus sanctitatis*. And all this saith the Apostle was declared so to be, or Christ was *declared* to be thus the Sonne of God, in respect of his *Divine, Holy, spirituall being*, which is opposed to the flesh, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, *by the* (or his) *Resurrection from the dead*, whereby an eminent Testimony was given unto His Deity: *He was declared to be the Sonne of God* thereby, according to the sence insisted on.

§. 51. To weaken this Interpretation, *Grotius* moves (as they say) every stone, and heaves at every word; but in vaine (1.) ὁρισθέντος, He tells is as much as προορισθέντος; as by the vulgar *latine* it is translated, *prædestinatus*. So he pleads it was interpreted by many of the Ancients. The places he quotes were most of them collected by *Beza*, in his *Annotations* on the place; who yet rejects their Judgement therein, and cites others to the contrary. *Luk.* 22. 22. *Acts* 10. 42. *Act.* 17. 31. are also urged by him to evince this sence of the word: in each of which places it *may* be rendred *declared*, or to *declare*; and in neither of them *ought* to be by *predestinated*. Though the word may sometimes signify so, (which is not proved) yet that it here doth so will not follow: ὅρος, a *definition* (from whence that word comes) declares what a thing is, makes it known. And ὁρίζω, may best be rendred to *declare Heb.* 4. 7. So in this place:

τὶ οὖν ἐστιν ὑιὸς θεοῦ ὃς θεῷ; δεσπότης, ἀπαράλλακτος; sayes *Chrysostome* on the place. And so doth the subject matter require. The Apostle treating of the way whereby Christ was manifested eminently to be the *Sonne of God*.

But the *most Learned mans* Exposition of this place is admirable. §. 52.

Jesus (saith he) *is many wayes said to be the Sonne of God.* [This is *begged* in the beginning, because it will not be proved in the end. If this be granted it matters not much what followes.] *But* (*most commonly or*) *most in a popular way, because he was raised unto a kingdome by God.* [Not once in the whole Booke of God. Let him, or any one for him, prove this by any one cleare Testimony from Scripture, and take his whole interpretation. The Sonne of God, as *Mediatour*, was exalted to a *Kingdome*, and made a *Prince and Saviour*. But that, by that Exaltation, he was made the *Sonne of God*, or was so on that account, is yet to be proved: yea, it is most false.] He goes on: *In that sence the words of the second Psalme were spoken of David, because he was exalted to a kingdome, which are applyed to Christ, Act.* 13.33. *Heb.* 1. 5. [But it is not proved that these words do at all belong to *David*, so much as in the type; nor any of the words from *v.*7. to the end of the Psalme. If they are so to be accommodated, they belong to the *manifestation*, not *constitution* of him: and so they are applyed to our *Saviour* when they relate to his *Resurrection*, as one who was thereby *manifested* to be the Sonne of God, according as God had spoken of him.] But now how was Christ Predestinated to this *sonship? This Kingly dignity, or the dignity of a Sonne, of Jesus, was predestinated and prefigured, when leading a mortall life, he wrought signes and wonders which is the sence of the words* ἐν δυνάμει. [The first sence of the word θεοῦ is here insensibly slipped from. *Predestinated* and *prefigured* are ill conjoyned, as words of a neighbouring significancy. To *Predestinate* is constantly ascribed to God, as an act of his, *foreappointing* things to their end: neither can this *learned man*

Jesus Filius Dei *multis modis dicitur. Maxime populariter, ideo quod in regnum a Deo evectus est; quo sensu verba Psalmi secundi, de Davide dicta, cum ad regnum pervenit, Christo aptantur.* Act. 13. 33. *& ad* Hæbreos 1. 5. *Hæc autem* Filii, *sive regia dignitas Jesu prædestinabatur & præfigurabatur tum cum mortalem agens vitam magna illa signa & prodigia ederet, quæ* δυνάμεων *voce denotantur, sæpe & singulariter* δυνάμεως *ut* Mar. 6. 5. & 9. 39. Luk. 4. 36. v. 17. 6. 19. 8. 46. 9. 1. Act. 13. 12. *Hæc signa edebat Iesus, per spiritum illum sanctitatis, id est, vim divinam, per quam ab initio conceptionis sanctificatus fuerat.* Luk. 1. 35. Mark. 2 8. Joh. 9. 36. *Ostenditur ergo Iesus nobilis ex materna parte, utpote ex rege terreno ortus; sed nobilior ex paterna parte, quippe a Deo factus Rex cælestis post Resurrectionem.* Gror. Annot. in Rom. 1. vers. 3, 4.

give one instance from the Scripture of any other signification of the word. And how comes now ὁρισθέντος to be *prefigured*, Is there the least colour for such a sence? Predestinated to be the Sonne of God with power: that is, *The signe he wrought prefigured that he should be exalted to a Kingdome.* He was by them in a good towardlinesse for it. It is true, δυνάμεις and sometimes δυνάμις, being in construction with some *transitive* verbe, do signify great or marveilous workes: but that ἐν δυνάμει, spoken of one declared to be so, hath the same signification is not proved. [He laddes, *These signes Iesus did by the spirit of Holinesse, that is, that divine efficacy wherewith he was sanctifyed from the beginning of his Conception Luk.* 1. 35. *Mark.* 2.8. *Joh.* 9.36. [In the two latter places there is not one word to the purpose in hand, perhaps he intended some other, and these are false *printed.* The first shall be afterwards considered. How it belongs to what is here asserted, I understand not. That Christ wrought miracles by the *efficacy of the grace of the Spirit*, with which he was sanctifyed, is ridiculous. If by the Spirit is understood his *spirituall divine naure*; This whole interpretation falls to the ground.] To make out the sence of the words he proceeds, *Iesus therefore is shewed to be noble on the mothers side, as comming of an earthly King, but more noble on his Fathers part; being made a heavenly King of God after his Resurrection. Heb.* 5.9. *Act.* 2.30. & 26.23. [And thus is this most evident Testimony of the Deity of Christ eluded, or endeavoured to be so. Christ on the Mothers side was the Sonne of *David*, that is, according to the flesh, of the same nature with her and him. On the *Fathers side*, He was the Sonne of God, of the same nature with him. That God was his Father, and he the son of God, because after his Resurrection he was made an *heavenly* King, is an *hellish figment.* Neither is there any one word or tittle in the Texts cited to prove it: that it is a marvell to what end they are mentioned, one of them expresly affirming, that He was the Son of God before his Resurrection *Heb.* 5.8,9.

§. 53. 2. He who was actually the *Son of God*, before his Conception, Nativity, Endowment with power, or exaltation, is not the Son of God on those accounts, but on that only, which is antecedent to them. Now by vertue of all the Arguments & Testimonies before recited, as also of all those that shall be produced for

for the proofe and evincing of the *Eternall Deity* of the Sonne of God, the proposition is unmoveably established, and the inference evidently followes thereupon.

But yet the proposition as layd down may admit of farther confirmation at present. It is then testified to, *Prov.*30.4. *What is his name, and what is his Sonnes name, if thou canst tell?* He was therefore the Sonne of God, and he was incomprehensible, even then before his Incarnation. *Psal.*2.7. *Thou art my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee. Isa.* 9. 6. *Unto us a Sonne is borne, unto us a Child is given, and the Government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderfull, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace.* He is a *Sonne*, as he is the *everlasting Father*. And to this head of Testimonyes belongs what we urged before from *Prov.*8.24. *&c. He is the Image of the invisible God, the first borne of every Creature, Col.*1. Which surely as to his Incarnation he was not, *Before Abraham was I am. Joh.*8.58. But of these places in the following Chapter I shall speake at large. §. 54.

3. Christ was so the Son of God, that he that was made *like Him* was to be without *Father, Mother*, or *Genealogy*, *Heb.*7.3. *Without Father, without Mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life, but made like the Son of God.* But now *Christ* in respect of his *Conception* & nativity, had a Mother, & one (they say) that supplyed the roome of *Father*, had a *Genealogy* that is upon record, and beginning of life, &c. So that upon these accounts He was not the Sonne of God, but on that, wherein he had none of all these things, in the want whereof, *Melchisedec* was made like to him. I shall only adde, §. 55.

4. That which only manifests the *filiation* of Christ, is not the cause of it. The cause of a thing is that which gives it, its being. The manifestation of it is only that which declares it to be so. That all the things insisted on, as the causes of *Christs Filiation*, by them with whom we have to do, did only declare & manifest him so to be, who was the Son of God, the Scripture witnesseth. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that holy thing, which shall be borne of thee shall be called the Sonne of God. Luk.* 1. 35. He shall be called so being thereby declared to be so. *And great is the Mystery of Godlinesse, God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seene of Angells, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received* §. 56.

up into glory 1 *Tim.* 3 16. All the causes of Christs *Filiation*, assigned by our Adversaries, are evidently placed as manifestations of God in him; or his being the Sonne of God: *Declared to be the Sonne of God with power, according to the Spirit of Holinesse, by the Resurrection from the dead. Rom.* 1.3. The Absurdity of assigning distinct, & so farre different causes of the same Effect of filiation, whether you make them totall, or partiall, need not be insisted on.

§. 57. Farther (to adde one consideration more) sayes *Socinus*, Christ was the sonne of God, upon the account of his *Holinesse*, and *Righteousnesse*, and therein his *likenesse* to God. Now this he had not according to his principles in his Infancy. He proves *Adam* not to have been righteous in the state of innocency, because he had yielded *actuall obedience to no Law*. No more had Christ done in his Infancy. Therefore (1.) He was not the sonne of God upon the account of his *Nativity*. Nor (2.) did he become the sonne of God any otherwise then we do, *viz.* by hearing the Word, learning the Mind, and doing the Will of God. (3.) God did not give his only begotten sonne for us, but gave the sonne of *Mary*, that he might (by all that which we supposed he had done for us) be made the *sonne of God*. And so (4.) This sending of Christ doth not so much commend the *Love of God* to us, as to him, that he sent him to dye & rise, that he might be made God, & the son of God. Neither (5.) can any eximious love to us of Christ, be seen in what he did & suffered; for had he not done and suffered what he did, he had not been the sonne of God. And also (6.) if Christ be on the account of his *Excellencyes*, *Graces*, and *Gifts*, the Sonne of God, which is one way of his Filiation insisted on, and to be God, and the Sonne of God, is as they say all one; and as it is indeed; then all who are renewed to the Image of God, and are thereby the *Sonnes of God* (as are all believers) are *Gods* also.

Prælect. cap. 8,9,10.

And this that hath been spoken, may suffice for the confirmation of the second Assertion, laid down at the entrance of this discourse.

§. 58. To the farther confirmation of this Assertion, two things are to be annexed. First, the Eversion of that *fancy* of *Episcopius*, before mentioned, and the rest of the *Socinianizing Arminians*,

that

that Christ is called the *sonne of God*, both on the account of his *Eternall sonship*, and also of those other particulars mentioned from him above. 2. To consider the texts of Scripture produced by M.B. for the confirmation of his insinuation, that Christ is not called the Son of God, because of his *eternall Generation of the Essence of his Father*. The first may easily be evinced by the ensuing Arguments.

§. 59. 1. The question formerly proposed to *Episcopius* may be renued. For if Christ be the Sonne of God, partly upon the account of his Eternall Generation, and so he is Gods proper and naturall Sonne; and partly upon the other accounts mentioned. Then

1. He is partly Gods *naturall* Son, and partly his *adopted* Son; partly his *eternall* Son, partly a *temporary* Son; partly a *begotten* Son, partly a *made* Son. Of which distinction in reference to Christ, there is not one *Iota* in the whole Book of God.

2. He is *made* the sonne of God, by that which only manifests Him to be the sonne of God, as the things mentioned do.

3. Christ is *equivocally* only, and not *univocally* called the son of God: for that which hath various and diverse causes of its being *so*, is *so equivocally*. If the Filiation of Christ hath such *equivocall* causes, as Eternall genetation, *actuall Incarnation*, and *Exaltation*, he hath an *equivocall* Filiation: which whether it be consistent with the scripture, which calls him the *proper Sonne of God*, needs no great paines to determine.

§. 60. 2. The scripture never conjoynes these causes of Christs Filiation, as causes in, and of the same kind; but expresly makes the one the sole cause *constituting*, & the rest, causes manifesting only; as hath been declared. And to shut up this discourse; if Christ be the *Sonne of man only*, because he was conceived of the substance of his Mother, He is the *Sonne of God* only, upon the account of his being begotten of the substance of his Father.

§. 61. There remaineth only the consideration of those Texts of scripture, which M. *Biddle* produceth to insinuate the *Filiation* of Christ to depend on other causes, and not his Eternall Generation of the Essence of his Father, which on the principles lay'd

lay'd down and proved, will receive a quick and speedy dispatch.

§. 62. The first place named by him, and universally insisted on by the whole tribe, is *Luk.* 1. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35. It is the last verse only that I suppose weight is lay'd upon. Though M. B. name the others, his *Masters* never do so. That of *v.* 33. seemes to deserve our notice in M. *Biddles* judgement, who changes the *character* of the words of it, for their significancy to his purpose. The words are: *Thou shalt conceive in thy wombe, and bring forth a Sonne and shalt call his name Jesus; He shall be great, and shall be called the Sonne, of the Highest.* What M. B. supposes may be proved from hence, at least how he would prove what he aimes at, I know not. That Jesus Christ, who was borne of the Virgin, was the *Sonne of the Highest*, we contend. On what account He was so, the place mentioneth not; but the reason of it is plentifully manifested in other places, as hath been declared.

§. 63. The words of *v.* 35. are more generally managed by them. *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also the holy Thing which shall be borne of thee shall be called the Sonne of God.* But neither doe these particles, διὸ καί, render a reason of Christs Filiation, nor are a note of the Consequent, but only of an inference or consequence, that ensues from what he spake before. It being so as I have spoken, *even that holy Thing that shall be borne of thee shall be called the Sonne of God.* There is weight also in that Expression: ἅγιον τὸ γενόμενον: that *Holy Thing, that shall be borne of thee.* ἅγιον is not spoken in the *concrete*, or as an *Adjective*, but *substantively*, and points out the naturall Essence of Christ, whence he was that *Holy thing.* Besides, if this be the cause of Christs Filiation which is assigned, it must be demonstrated, that Christ was on that account *called* the Son of God; for so hath it been said, that He should be: but there is not any thing in the new Testament to give light, that ever Christ was on this account *called* the Sonne of God: nor can the Adversaries produce any such instance.

§. 64. 2. It is evident, that the Angell in these words acquaints the blessed Virgin, that in, and by her conception, the Prophesy of

of *Isaiah* should be accomplished, which you have *Chap.* 7. 14. *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and beare a Sonne, and shall call his name Immanuell*: as the expresse words of *v.* 31. in *Luke* declare; being the same with these of the Prophesy, *Behold thou shalt conceive in thy wombe, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call &c. v.* 31, 32. And *Mat.* 1.21. this very thing being related, it is said expressly to be done according to what was *foretold by the Prophet*, *v.*33. repeating the very words of the Holy Ghost by *Isaiah*, which are mentioned before. Now *Isaiah* foretelleth two things. First, that a *Virgin should conceive.* 2. That he that was so conceived should be *Immanuel, God with us*: or the Sonne of God, as *Luke* here expresses it. And this is that which the Angel here acquaints the blessed Virgin withall upon her enquiry *v.*34. even that according to the prediction of *Isaiah*, she should conceive, and bare a Sonne, though a *Virgin*, and that that Sonne of hers should be called the *Sonne of God.*

By the way, *Grotius* his dealing with this Text, both in his *Annotations* on *Isa.*8. as also in his large discourse on *Math.* 1. 21,22,23. is intollerable, and full of offence, to all that seriously weigh it. It is too large here to be insisted on. His maine designe is to prove, that this is not spoken directly of Christ, but only aplyed to him by a certain general *Accommodation.* God may give time & leasure, farther to lay open the heape of *Abominations*, which are couched in those *Learned Annotations* throughout. Which also appeares,

3. From the *Emphaticallnesse* of the expression καὶ *even also*, that *holy Thing* which is borne of *thee*, even *that* shall be called the Sonne of God; and not only that Eternall Word that is incarnate. That ἅγιον τὸ γενόμενον, being in it selfe ἀνυπόστατον, shall be called the Sonne of God: shall be *called* so, that is, appeare to be so, and be declared to be so with power. It is evident then that the cause of Christs Filiation is not here insisted on, but the consequence of the *Virgins* Conception declared; that which was *borne of her* should be *called the Son of God.* §. 65.

And this *Socinus* is so sensible of, that he dares not say, that Christ was *compleately* the Sonne of God, upon his Conception and Nativity, which if the cause of his Filiation were here §. 66.

ex-

Constat igitur (ut ad propositum revertamur,) Christum ante resurrectionem Dei Filium plene & perfecte non fuisse: cum illi & immortalitatis & absoluti dominii cum deo similitudo deesset. Socin. Respon. ad Wiekum. pag. 225.

expressed, he must be. *It is manifest* (saith he) *that Christ before his Resurrection was not fully and compleatly the Sonne of God: being not like God before in immortallity and absolute rule.*

§. 66. M. *Biddles* next place, whereby the *Sonship* of Christ is placed on another account, as he supposes, is *Joh.* 10. 36. *Say you of him whom the Father hath sanctifyed, and sent into the world, thou blaspheme st, because I said I am the Son of God.*

That this Scripture is called to remembrance not at all to M. B's advantage will speedily appeare. For

§. 67. 1. Here is not in the words the least mention *whence*, or *for What cause* it is, that Christ is the Sonne of God: but only that He is so; He being expressed and spoken of, under that description which is used of him 20 times in that Gospel, *He who is sent of the Father.* This is all that is in this place asserted, that he whom the Father *sanctifyed, and sent into the world*, counted it no Robery to be equall *with* him, nor did blaspheme in calling himselfe his Sonne.

§. 68. 2. It is evident that Christ in these words asserts himselfe to be such a Sonne of God, as the Jewes charged him with blasphemy, for affirming of himselfe that he was. For He justifies himselfe aginst their accusation; Not denying in the least, that they *rightly apprehended* and understood him, but maintaining what He had spoken to be most true. Now this was *that* which the Jewes charged him withall, *v.* 33. that He being *man, blasphemed in making himselfe God.* For so they understood Him, that in asserting his *Sonship*, he asserted also his *Deity.* This Christ makes good, namely that he is such a Sonne of God, as is God also. Yea he makes good what he had said, *v.* 30. which was the foundation of all the following discourse about his blasphemy: *I and my Father are one.* So that

§. 69. 3. An invinsible Argument for the Sonship of Christ, to be placed only upon the account of his eternall Generation, ariseth from this very place that was produced to oppose it. He who is the Sonne of God, because he is *one with the Father*, and God equall to him, is the the Sonne of God, upon the account

count of his *Eternall* Relation to the Father: but that such was the condition of Jesus Christ, himselfe here beares witnesse to the *Jewes*, although they are ready to stone him for it. And of his not blaspheming in this Assertion, he convinces his Adversaries by an Argument *a minori*, *vers.* 34, 35.

A briefe *Analysis* of this place will give evidence to this Interpretation of the words. Our Saviour Christ having given the Reason, why the *Jewes* believed not on him, namely because they *were not of his sheep*, *v.* 26. describes thereupon both the nature of those Sheep of his *v.* 27. And their condition of *safety v.* 28. This he farther confirmes from the Consideration of his Fathers greatnesse and power, which is amplifyed by the comparison of it with others, who are all lesse then He, *v.* 29. As also from his own Power and Will, which appeares to be sufficient for that end and purpose from his Essentiall unity with his Father, *v.* 30. The Effect of this discourse of Christ by Accident, is the *Jewes taking up of stones*, which is amplifyed by this, that it was the second time they did so, and that to this purpose, that they might stone him, *v.* 31. Their folly and madnesse herein Christ disproves with an *Argument ab absurdo*; telling them, that it must be for some good *worke that they stoned him*, for evill he had done none. *v.* 32. This the Jews attempt to disprove, by a new Argument *a disparatis*, telling him that it was not for a good work, but for blasphemy, that he *made himselfe to be God*, whom they would prove to be but a *man*, *v.* 33. This pretence of *Blasphemy* Christ disproves (as I said before) by an Argment *a minori v.* 35, 36. And with another from the Effects, or the workes which he did, which sufficiently proved him to be God, *v.* 27, 38. Still maintaining what he said and what they thought to be *Blasphemy*, so that they attempt againe to kill him, *v.* 39. It is evident then, that He still maintained what they charged him with. §. 70.

4. And this answers that expression which is so frequent in the Scripture, of *Gods sending his Sonne into the world*, and that he came *down from Heaven, and came into the world*, *Joh.* 3. 13. *Gal.* 4. 4. All evincing his being the *Sonne of God*, antecedently to that Mission, or Sanctification, whereby in the world he was de- §. 71.

clared so to be. Otherwise not the *Sonne* of God was sent, but one to be his Sonne.

§. 72. *Act.* 13. 32, 33. is also insisted on: *We declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fullfilled the same unto us, their Children, in that he hath raised up Jesus againe, as it is also written in the second Psalme, thou art my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee.*

He that can see in this Text, a cause assigned of the Filiation of Christ, that should relate to the *Resurrection*, I confesse is sharper sighted then I. This I know, that if Christ were made the Sonne of God by his *Resurrection* from the dead, *He* was not the *Son of God who dyed*, for that preceded *this* his *making* to be the Sonne of God. But that God *gave his only begotten Son to dye*, that he *spared not* his only Sonne, but gave him up to *death*, I think is cleare in Scripture, if any thing be so.

§. 73. 2. *Paul* seemes to interpret this place to me, when he informes us, that *Christ was declared to be the Son of God with Power, by the Resurrection from the dead*, *Rom.* 1. 3. Not that he was made so, but he was declared, or made known to be so. When being *crucified through weakenesse, he lived by the Power of God*, 2 *Cor.* 13. 4. Which power also was his own, *Joh.* 10. 18.

§. 74. According as was before intimated, *Grotius* interprets these words, *Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee: I have made thee a King; which* (he sayes) *was fullfilled in that, when all power was given him in Heaven and Earth Math.* 28. 18. as *Justin* in his Colloquie with *Trypho*. τότε γέγεσθαι αὐτὸν λέγων γεγέσθαι, ἐξότε ἡ γνῶσις αὐτῷ ἔμελλε γενέσθαι. But then he was not the *Son of God* before his Resurrection: for he was the Sonne of God by his being *begotten* of him: which as it is false, so contrary to his own *Glosse* on *Luk.* 1. 35. (2.) Christ was a *King* before his *Resurrection*, and owned himselfe so to be, as hath been shewed. (3.) *Justins* words are suited to our exposition of this place: He was said to be then *begotten*, because then he was made *known* to be so the Sonne of God. (4.) That these words are not applyed to Christ in their first sence, in respect of Resurrection, from the prehemineence assigned unto him above Angells by vertue of this expression, *Heb.* 1. 5. which he had before his death, *Heb.* 1. 6. Nor (5.) Are the words here used to prove

Ego filii hodie te genui, id est regem te feci: hoc in Christo impletum, cum ei data omnis potestas in Cœlo & in terra. Math. 28. 18. &c. *Grot. in Locum.*

the

the Resurrection, which is done in the verses following out of *Isaiah*, and another *Psalme*; *And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead &c. v.* 34. but then

3. It is not an interpretation of the meaning of that passage in the *Psalme*, which *Paul Act.* 13. insists on; but the proving that Christ was the *Son of God*, as in that *Psalme* he was called, by his *Resurrection from the dead*: which was the great manifesting cause of his Deity in the world.

What M. B. intends by the next place mentioned by him, I know not. It is *Rev.* 1.5. *And from Jesus Christ who is the faithfull witnesse, and the first begotten of the dead.* That Christ was the *first* who was raised from the dead, to a *blessed and glorious immortality*, and is thence called the *first begotten* of them, or *from the dead*, and that all that rise to such an immortallity, rise after him, and by vertue of his Resurrection, is most certaine and granted; but that from thence he is that *only begotten Son of God*, though thereby he was only declared so to be, there is not the least tittle in the Text giving occasion to such an apprehension.

And the same also is affirmed of the following place of *Col.* 1.18. where the same words are used againe. He is the head of the Church, who is the beginning, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν: the first borne of the dead. Only I shall desire our *Catechist* to look at his leisure, a little higher into the *chapter*, where he will find him called also πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, the first borne of all the Creation; so that he must surely be πρωτότοκος before his Resurrection: nay he is so *the first borne of every creature*, as to be * none of them: for *by him they were all created*, *v.* 16. He who is so before all Creatures, as to be none of them, but that they are all created by him, is God blessed for ever: which when our *Catechist* disproves, he shall have me for one of *his Disciples*.

Of the same kind is that which M. *Biddle* next urgeth from *Heb.* 1.4,5. only it hath this further disadvantage, that both the verses going immediately before, and that immediately following after, do inevitably evince, that the *Constitutive* cause of the Sonship of Jesus Christ, *a priori*, is in his *participation of the divine nature*, and that it is only manifested by any ensuing Consideration, *v.* 2,3. The Holy Ghost tells us, that *by him God made the world, who is the brightnesse of his glory and the expresse image*

* So that πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως is, ὁ πρὸ πάσης κτίσεως, *qui genitus est prior omni creaturâ, vel ante omnem creaturam*, for πρῶτος sometimes signifies cõparatively. *Arist: Auibus.* πρῶτον Δαρεῖον. *id est* πρότερον. *Ioh:* 1.15. πρῶτός μου ἦν (*i.e.*) πρότερός. & 1 *Ioh:* 4. 19. πρῶτος ἠγάπησεν (*i.e.*) πρότερος. His generation was before the creation, indeed eternall. *Tertullian* saith so too. Lib. de Trinitate, *Quomodo primogenitus esse potuit, nisi quia secundum divinitatem ante omnem creaturam ex Deo Patre semper genitus.*

of his person, and this as the Son of God, antecedent to any exaltation as Mediatour: & *v.6. He brings in the first begotten into the world, and say's, let all the Angells of God worship him.* He is the *first begotten* before his *bringing into the world*; and that this is proved by the latter clause of the verse, shall be afterwards demonstrated. Between both these, much is not like to be spoken against the Eternal Sonship of Christ. Nor is the Apostle only declaring his *preheminence* above the Angells, upon the account of that name of his, the *Son of God*, which he is called upon record, in the old Testament; but the causes also of that appellation he had before declared.

§.79. The last place urged to this purpose is of the same import. It is *Heb.* 5.5. *So Christ also glorifyed not himselfe, to be made an high Priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* When M. *B.* proves any thing more towards his purpose frō this place, but only that Christ did not of his own accord undertake the office of a *Mediatour*, but was designed to it of God his Father, who said unto him, *Thou art my Sonne this day have I begotten thee* declaring of him so to be, with power after his Resurrection, I shall acknowledge him to have better skill in disputing, then as yet I am convinced he is possessed of.

§. 80. And thus have I cleared the *Eternall Sonship* of Jesus Christ, and evidenced the vanity of attempting to fix his prerogative therein upon any other account: not doubting, but that all who *love him in sincerity*, will be zealous of his glory herein. For his growing up to be the Sonne of God by degrees, to be *made* a God in processe of time, to be the *adopted Sonne* of God; to be the Sonne of God upon various accounts of diverse *kinds*, inconsistent with one another, to have had such a Conception & Generation, as *modesty* forbids to think, or expresse; not to have been the Sonne of God, untill after his death, and the like monstrous figments, I hope He will himselfe keep his own in an everlasting abhorring of.

The farther confirmation of the Deity Christ, whereby *M. Biddles* whole designe will be obviated, and the vindication of the Testimonyes whererewith it is so confirmed from his Masters, is the worke designed for the next Chapter.

There

There are yet remaining of this Chapter two or three Questions, looking the same way with those already considered, and will upon the principles already laid down, & insisted on, easily, and in very few words be turned aside from prejudicing the Eternall Deity of the Sonne of God. His 10th then is,

What saith the Sonne concerning the prerogative of the Father above him? And answer is given, Joh. 14.28. Mark. 13.22. Math. 24.36. Whereunto is subjoyned another of the same; *What saith the Apostle Paul?* Answ. 1 Cor. 15. 24, 28. 1 Cor. 11. 3.

The intendment of these questions being the application of what is spoken of Christ, either as *Mediator* or as *man*, unto his *Person*, to the exclusion of any other consideration, *viz.* that of *a divine Nature* therein, the whole of M. *Biddles* ayme in them is sufficiently already disapointed. It is true, there is an *Order*, yea a *Subordination* in the Persons of the Trinity themselves; whereby the *Sonne*, as to his *Personality*, may be said to depend on the *Father*, being begotten of him; but that is not the *Subordination* here aimed at by M. B. but that which he underwent by dispensation as Mediatour, or which attends him in respect of his Humane Nature. All the difficulty that may arise from these kinds of attribution to Christ, the Apostle abundantly salves in the discovery of the rise and occasion of them, *Phil.* 2. 7,8,9. He who was in the *forme of God, and equall to him*, was, in the forme of a *servant*, whereunto he humbled himselfe, *his* servant, and lesse then he. And there is no more difficulty in the Questions wherewith *M. B. amuses* himselfe and his Disciples, then there was in that, wherewith our Saviour stopt the mouth of the *Pharisees, viz.* how Christ could be the *Sonne of David*, and yet his *Lord*, whom he worshipped? For the places of Scripture in particular urged by M. *Biddle Joh.* 14.28. Sayes our Saviour, my Father is *greater then I* (*mittens misso*, sayes *Grotius* himselfe referring the words to *Office* not *Nature*) which he was, and is in respect of that worke of *Mediation*, which he had undertaken;

Ideo autem nusquam Scriptum est, quod Deus pater major sit Spiritu Sancto, vel Spiritus Sanctus minor Deo patre: quia non sic assumpta est creatura in qua appareret S. S. sicut assumptus est Filius hominis, in qua forma ipsius Verbi Dei persona præsentaretur. Augustl. lib. 1. de Trinit. cap. 6.

but

but *inæqualitas officii non tollit æqualitatem naturæ.* A Kings Son is of the same nature with his Father, though he may be imployed by him in an inferiour office. He that was lesse then his Father, as to the worke of Mediation, being the Fathers servant therein, is equall to him as his Sonne, as God to be blessed for ever, *Mark.* 13.32. *Math.* 24.36. affirme, that the Father only *knowes the times and seasons mentioned, not the Angells, nor the Sonne.* And yet notwithstanding it was very truely said of *Peter* to Christ, *Lord thou knowest all things, Joh.* 22. 17. He that *in,* and of the knowledge & wisdome, which as *man* he had, and wherein he *grew* from his infancy, *knew not* that day, yet as he *knew all things* knew it: It was not hidden from him, being the day by him appointed. Let M. *Biddle* acknowledge, that his *knowing all things* proves him to be *God,* and *we* will not deny, but his not *knowing* the day of Judgement, proves him to have another capacity, and to be truely *man.*

* Αὐτὸ ἐστιν ὁ ὃς κὴ φυσικὰ κὴ ἀδιάβλητα πάθη; μόνῳ ὑὸς ὁ πεὶν ἢ Abegadm γνῶς, ὧν: κὴ ὅτι ἐμὲ ἐχά- των, πεγκό- φας σοφίας κὴ ἀλήθειας πατὴρ ἐστίν. ἔχει γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸ πλήρωμα. *Proclus. Episcop. Constan. Epist. ad Armenios.*

* As man he took on him those *Affections,* which we call which, or *consequently* unto which, he might be *ignorant* of some things. In the meane time he *who made all times,* as Christ did *Heb.* 1.2. knew their end, as well as their beginning. He knew the Father, and the day by him appointed; yea all things that the *Father hath were his:* and in Him were all the *treasures of wisdome and knowledge hid,* Col. 2. 3.

§. 83. *Paul* speaks to the same purpose, 1 *Cor:* 15.24,28. The Kingdome that Christ doth now peculiarly *exercise,* is his *Oeconomicall* mediatory Kingdome, which shall have an end put to it, when the whole of his intendment in that work shall be fulfilled, and accomplished. But that He is not also sharer with his Father, in that *universall Monarchy,* which, as God by nature, he hath over all, this doth not at all prove. All the Argument from this place is but this; *Christ shall cease to be Mediatour,* therefore he is not God. And that no more is here intended, is evident from the expression of it: *Then shall the Sonne himselfe be subiect;* which if it intend any thing, but the ceasing from the Administration

of

of the *mediatory Kingdome*, wherein the humane nature is a sharer, it would prove, that as Jesus Christ is Mediatour, *he is not in subjection* to his Father, which himselfe abundantly hath manifested to be otherwise. Of 1 *Cor.* 11. 3. & 3. 22, 23. there is the same reason; both speaking of Christ as Mediator; whence that no Testimony can be produced against his Deity, hath been declared.

He Adds 12th Q. *Howbeit is not Christ dignified, as with the title of Lord, so with the title of God in the Scripture?* Ans. *Thomas saith my Lord, and my God.* Verily, if *Thomas* said, that *Christ was his God*, and said *true*, M. B. is to *blame*, who denyes him to be God at all. With this one *blast* of the spirit of the Lord is his fine *Fabrick* of Religion blown to the ground. And it may be supposed, that M. B. made mention of this portion of Scripture, that he might have the honour of *cutting his own throat*, and destroying his own cause; or rather, that God in his Righteous judgement hath forced him to open his mouth to his own shame. What ever be the cause of it, M. B. is very farre from escaping this sword of the Lord, either by his *insinuation* in the present *Quere*, or diversion in the following: For the present: it was not the intent of *Thomas* to *dignify Christ with Titles*, but to make a plaine *Confession of his Faith*, being called upon by Christ to *believe*. In this state he professes, that he believes him to be his *Lord* and *his God*. *Thomas* doubtlesse was a Christian; and M. B. tells us that Christians have *but one God*, 1. Chap: Qu. 1. *Eph.* 4. 6. Jesus Christ then being the *God of Thomas*, he is the Christians *one God:* if Mr B. may be believed. It is not then the *dignifying of Christ with Titles*, which it is not for men to do, but the naked confession of a Believers Faith, that in these words is expressed. Christ is the Lord and God of a Believer; *Ergo*, the only true God; as 1 Joh: 5. 19. M. B. perhaps will tell you, he was made a God; so one Abomination begets another, Infidelity Idolatry: of this afterward. But yet he was not according to his Companions made a God before his Ascention; which was not yet, when *Thomas* made his solemne Confession. §. 84.

Some attempt also is made upon this place by *Grotius*: ὁ Θεός μου. *He first* (saith he) *in the story of the Gospell is this* §. 85.

word

word found ascribed by the Apostle unto Jesus Christ (which *Maldonat* before him observed for another purpose) *to wit, after he had by his Resurrection proved himselfe to be him, from whom life and that Eternall, ought to be expected. And this custome abode in the Church, as appeares not only in the Apostolicall writings*, Rom. 9. 5. *and of the Ancient Christians, as may be seen in Justin Martyr against Trypho, but in the Epistle also of Plinie unto Trajant, where he sayes, that the Christians sang verses to Christ, as to God*: or as the words are in the Author, *Carmen Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secũ invicẽ*. What the intendment of this discourse is, is evident to al those, who are a little exercised in the writings of them, whom our Author al along in his *Annotations* takes *care* of. That Christ was now *made a God* at his *Resurrection*, & is so called from the power wherewith he was entrusted at his Ascention, is the aime of this discourse. Hence he tells us, it became a *custome to call him God among the Christians*, which also abode amongst them. And to prove this custome, wrests that of the Apostle *Rom. 9. 5.* where the Deity of Christ is spoken of, in opposition to his *humane nature*, or his *flesh*, that he had of the *Jewes*, plainely asserting a divine nature in him, calling him God *subjectively*, and not only by way of *Attribution*. But this is it seemes a custome taken up after Christs Resurrection to *call him God*, and so continued; though *Iohn* testify expressly, that he *was God in the beginning*. It is true indeed, much is not to be argued from the expression of the Apostles, before the powring out of the Spirit upon them, as to any eminent acquaintance with Spirituall things: Yet they had before made this solemne Confession, that Christ was the *Sonne of the Living God*, *Math. 16. 16, 17, 18.* which is to the full as much as what is here by *Thomas* expressed. That the *primitive* Christians worshipped Christ, and invocated him, not only as a *God*, but professing him to be the *true God and Eternall life*, we have better Testimonys then that of a blind *Pagan*, who knew nothing of them, nor their ways, but by the report of *Apostates*, as himselfe confesseth. But *Learned men* must have leave to make knowne their Readings, and observations, whatever become of the *simplicity* of the Scripture.

Hic primum ea vox in narratione Evangelica reperitur ab Apostolis Jesu tributa, postquam scilicet sua Resurrectione probaverat se esse, a quo vita & quidem aterna, expectari deberet. Mansit deinde ille mos in Ecclesia, ut apparet non tantum in Scriptis Apostolicis ut Rom. 9. 5. *& veterum Christianorum ut videre est apud Justinum Martyrem contra Triphonem, sed & in Plinii ad Trajanum Epistola, ubi ait Christianos Christo, ut Deo, carmina cecinisse.* Grot. in locum.

To

To escape the dint of this sword M. *Biddle* nextly §. 86.
Queries.

Was he so the God of Thomas, as that He himselfe in the meane time, did not acknowledge another to be his God? Ans. Joh. 20. 17. Revel. 3. 12.

True, He who being partaker of the divine Essence, in the forme of God, was *Thomas* his God; as he was Mediatour, the head of his Church, interceding for them, acknowledged his *Father* to be *his God*. Yea God may be said to be *his* God, upon the account of his Sonship, and *Personality*, in which regard he hath his Deity of his Father, and is *God of God*. Not that he is a *secundary, lesser, made God, a Hero, Semideus*, as M. B. fancies him: but *God blessed for ever*, in order of subsistence depending on the Father.

Of the same nature is the last question, *viz. Have you any* §. 87.
passage in the Scripture, where Christ at the same time hath the Appellation of God given to him, and is said to have a God? Ans. Heb. 1. 8, 9.

By M. B's favour, Christ is not said to *have a God*, though God be said to be his God, 2. *v.* 8. Christ by M. *Biddles* Confession is expresly called God. He is then the *one true* God with the Father, or another: if the first, what doth he contend about? If the second, He is a God, that is not God by *nature*, that is, not the *one* God of Christians, and consequently an *Idol* & indeed such is the Christ that M. B. worshippeth. Whither this will be waved by the helpe of that expression *v.* 9. *God thy God*; where it is expresly spoken of him, in respect of his undertaking the office of mediation, wherein he was *annointed of God with the oyle of gladnesse above his fellowes*, God and his Saints will judge.

Thus the close of this Chapter, through the good wise hand §. 88.
of the providence of God, leaving himselfe and his Truth not without witnesse, hath produced instances, and evidences of the Truth opposed, abundantly sufficient, without farther enquiry and labour, to discover the *sophistry* and vanity of all M. *Biddles* former Queries, and insinuations; for which let him have the praise.

CHAP. VIII.

An entrance into the examination of the Racovian Catechisme, in the businesse of the Deity of Christ: their Arguments against it Answered: and testimonys of the Eternity of Christ vindicated.

§. 1. ALthough the Testimonies & Arguments for the Deity of Christ might be urged, and handled to a better advantage, if liberty might be used to insist upon them, in the method that seemes most naturall for the clearing and confirmation of this important Truth, yet that I may do two workes at once, I shall insist chiefely, if not only, on those texts of Scripture, which are proposed to be handled, and answered by the Author, or Authors of the *Racovian Catechisme*, which worke takes up neare one fourth part of their Book, and (and as it is well known) there is no part of it, wherein so much dilligence, paines, sophistry, and cunning are imployed, as in that Chapter of the *Person of Christ*, which by Gods assistance we are entring upon the consideration of.

§. 2. Those who have considered their *writings* know, that the very substance of al they have to say, for the evading of the force of our Testimonys, for the Eternall Deity of Christ, is comprized in that Chapter, there being no any thing materiall, that any of them have elsewhere written, there omitted. And those who are acquainted with *them*, their Persons, and Abilitys, doe also know, that their great strength and ability for disputation, lys in giving plausible Answers, and making exceptions against Testimonys, caveling at every word and letter, being in proofe and Argument for the most part *weake and contemptible*. And therefore in this long Chapter of neare an 100 *pages*, all that themselves propose by way of Argument, against the Deity of Christ, is contained in two or three at the most; the residue being wholy taken up with exceptions to so many of the Texts of Scripture, wherein the Deity of Christ is asserted, as they have been pleased to take notice of. A course which themselves

are

are forced to * *Apologize* for, as unbecoming *Catechists.*

I shall then, the Lord assisting, consider that whole Chapter of theirs, in both parts of it; as to what they have to say for themselves, or to plead against the Deity of Christ; as also what they bring forth for their defence against the evidence of the light that shineth from the Texts, whose consideration they propose to themselves, to which many of like sort may be added.

* Interpres Lect. Præfat. ad Catech. Raco.

§. 3.

I shall only informe the Reader, that this is a businesse quite beyond my first intention in this Treatise, to whose undertaking I have been prevailed on, by the desires and intreaties of some, who knew that I had this other worke imposed on me.

§. 4.

§. 5.

Their first Question and Answer are,

a *Declare now to me, what I ought to know concerning Jesus Christ?*

A. *Thou must know, that of the things which thou oughtest to know, some belong to the Essence of Christ, and some to his office.*

Q. 2. *What are they which relate to his Person?*

A. *That only, that by nature he is a true man, even as the Scriptures doe often witnesse: amongst others,* 1 Tim. 2. 5. 1 Cor. 15. 21. *Such an one as God of old promised by the Prophets, and such as the Creed, commonly called the Apostles, witnesseth him to be, which with us all Christians imbrace.*

a *Rogatum te velim, ut mihi ea de Jesu Christo exponas, quæ me scire oporteat?*

Sciendum tibi est, quædam ad essentiam Jesu Christi, quædam ad illius munus referri, quæ te scire oportet.

Quænam ea sunt, quæ ad personam ipsius referuntur?

Id solum, quod natura sit homo verus, quemadmodum ea de re crebro Scripturæ sacræ testantur: inter alias 1 Tim. 2. 5. *&* 1 Cor. 15. 21 *qualem olim Deus per Prophetas promiserat, & qualem etiam esse testatur fidei Symbolum, quod vulgo Apostolicum vocant, quod nobiscum universi Christiani amplectuntur.*

Ans. That Jesus Christ was a *true man*, in his nature like unto us, *sinne only excepted*, we believe: and doe abhorre the abominations of *Paracelsus*, *Wigelius*, *&c.* and the *Famelists* amongst our selves, who destroy the verity of his humane Nature. But that the *Socinians* believe the same, that he is a man in Heaven, whatever he was upon the Earth, I presume the Reader will judge, that it may be justly questioned, from what I have to offer (and shall doe it in its place) on that account. But that this is all that we ought to know concerning the Person of Christ, is a thing of whose folly and vanity our

§. 6.

Catechists will be one day convinced. The present tryall of it between us depends in part, on the consideration of the Scriptures, which shall afterward be produced to evince the contrary: our plea from whence shall not here be Anticipated. The places of Scripture they mention prove him to be a *true man*: that *as man* he *dyed* and *rose*: but that he who was man, was not also in *one person* God, (The name of *man* there expressing the *person*, not the *nature* of man only,) they prove not. The Prophets foretold that Christ should be such a man, as should also be the *Sonne of God, begotten* of him *Psal.* 2. 7. the mighty God, *Isa.* 9. 6, 7. Jehovah *Jerem.* 23. 6. The Lord of Hosts, *Zech.* 2 8, 9. And the Apostles Creed also (as it is unjustly called) confesseth him to be the *only Son of God, our Lord*, and requires us to *believe in him*; as we doe *in God the Father*; which if he

§. 7. were not God, were an *accursed thing*, *Jerem.* 17. 5.

Ergo Dominus Iesus est purus homo?

Nullo pacto: etenim est conceptus e Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine, eoq; ab ipsa conceptione & ortu Filius Dei est, ut ea de re Luk. 1. 35. *legimus ubi Angelus Mariam ita alloquitur: Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te, &c. Ut alias causas non afferam, quas post modum in Iesu Christi persona deprehendes, quæ evidentissime ostendunt, dominum Iesum pro* puro *homine nullo modo accipi posse.*

Q. 3. "Is therefore the Lord Jesus a "pure (or meere) man?

A. "By no meanes! for he was con- "ceived of the Holy Ghost, borne of the "Virgin Mary, and therefore from his "very conception and birth was the Son "of God: as we read *Luk.* 1. 35. that I "may not bring other causes, which thou "wilt afterward find in the person of "Christ, which most evidently declare, "that the Lord Jesus can by no meanes be "esteemed a pure (or meer) man.

1. *Ans.* But 1. I have abundantly demonstrated, that Christ neither *was*, nor *was called the Son of God*, upon the account here mentioned, nor any other intimated in the close of the Answer whatever; but meerely and solely, on that of his *Eternall Generation* of the Essence of his Father.

2. The inquiry is after the *Essence* of Christ, which receives not any *Alteration* by any kind of eminency, or dignity that belongs to his Person. If Christ be by Essence only man, let him have what *Dignity* or *Honour* he can have possibly conferred upon him, let him be *borne* by what meanes soever, as to his Essence and nature, he is a *man* still, *but* a man, and not *more* then a man; that is, *purus homo*, A *meere man*, and not φύσει θεὸς,

God

God by nature; but such a God as the *Gentiles* worshipped *Gal:* 4.8. His being *made God*, and the *Son* of God, afterward, which our *Catechists* pretend, relating to *Office* and *Dignity*, not to his *Nature*; exempts him not at all from being a *meere man*. This then is but a flourish to delude poor simple soules, into a beliefe of their honourable thoughts of Christ, whom yet they think no otherwise of, then the *Turkes* do of *Mahomet*; nor believe he was otherwise indeed, or is to *Christians*, then as *Moses* to the *Jewes*. That which *Paul* speaks of the *Idolls* of the heathen, that they were *not Gods by nature*, may according to the apprehension of these *Catechists* be spoken of Christ; notwithstanding any Exaltation or *Deification* that he hath received; He is by *nature no God*. Yea the apprehensions of these Gentlemen concerning Christ, and his Diety, are the same upon the matter with those of the *Heathen*, concerning their *Worthies* and *Heroes*, who by an ἀποθέωσις were translated into the number of their Gods; as *Jupiter*, *Hercules*, and others. They called them Gods indeed; but put them close to it, they acknowledged that properly there was but *one God*; but that these men were honoured, as being upon their great Worth, and Noble Atchievements, taken up to blessednesse and power. Such an *Hero*, an *Hermes*, or *Mercury*, do they make of Jesus Christ; who for his faithfull declaring the will of God, was *Deified*; But, in respect of Essence and nature, which here is inquired after, if he be *any thing* according to their principles, (of making which supposall I shall give the Reader a faire account) he *was*, he *is*, and will be a *meer man* to all Eternity, and no more. They allow him no more, as to his *Essence*, then that, wherein he was like *us in all things, sin only excepted*. *Heb:* 2.

§. 8.

Q. [c] *You said a little above, that the Lord Jesus is by nature man, hath he also a divine nature?*

A. *No: for that is not only repugnant to sound reason, but also to the Scriptures.*

[c] *Dixeras paulo superius Dominum Jesum* natura *esse hominem; an idem habet naturam divinam?*

Nequaquam: nam id non solum rationi sanæ, verum etiã Divinis literis repugnat.

But this is that which is now to be put to the triall; whether the Asserting of the Diety of Christ be *repugnant to the Scriptures* or no? and as we shall see in the issue, that as these *Catechists* have not been able to answer, or evade the evidence of any one Testimony

Testimony of Scripture, of *more then an hundred*, that are produced for the confirmation of the Truth of his Eternall Deity, so notwithstanding the pretended flourish here at the entrance, that they are not able to produce *any one* place of Scripture, so much as in appearance, rising up against it. For that *Right Reason*, which in this matter of *meer divine Revelation* they boast of, and give it the preheminence in their disputes against the Person of Christ, above the Scripture, unlesse they discover the consonancy of it to the Word, to the *Law, and Testimonies*, what ever they propose on that account, may be *rejected* with as much *facility*, as it is proposed. But yet! if by *Right Reason*, they understand Reason, so farre *captivated to the obedience* of Faith, as to acquiesse in what ever God hath revealed, and to receive it as Truth, then which duty, there is not any more eminent *dictate* of *Right Reason* indeed: We for ever deny the first part of this Assertion, and shall now attend to the proofe of it; nor do we here plead, that Reason is blind and corrupted, and that the *naturall man cannot discerne the things of God*, and so require that men do prove themselves *regenerate*, before we admit them to judge of the Truth of the *propositions* under debate, which though necessary for them, who would know the Gospell for their own good, so as to be *wise unto salvation*, yet it being the *Grammaticall* and literall sence of *Propositions*, as laid downe in the Word of the Scripture, that we are to judge of in this case, we require no more of men to the purpose in hand, but an *assent* to this Proposition (which if they will not give, we can by undeniable demonstration compell them to) *what ever God, who is Prima veritas, hath revealed, is true*, whether we can comprehend the things revealed or no: which being granted, we proceed with our *Catechists* in their Attempt.

§. 9.

Q. 1. d *Declare how it is contrary to Right Reason.*

A. "First in this regard, that two substances having contrary properties cannot meet in one person; such as are, to be mortall and immortall, to have a beginning, and to want a beginning, to be changeable and unchangeable.

d *Cedo quî rationi sanæ repugnat?*

Primo, ad eum modum, quod duæ substantiæ, proprietatibus adversæ, coire in unam personam nequeant, ut sunt, mortalem & immortalem esse, principium habere, & principio carere: mutabilem & immutabilem existere.

2.

2. "Becauſe two natures, each of them conſti-
"tuting a Perſon, cannot likewiſe agree, or meet in
"one Perſon: for inſteed of one, there muſt (then)
"be two Perſons, and ſo alſo two Chriſts would
"exiſt: whom all without controverſy acknow-
"ledge to be one, and his perſon one.

Deinde, quod duæ naturæ personam ſingulæ conſtituentes, in unam perſonam convenire itidem nequeant; nam loco unius duas perſonas eſſe oporteret, atq; ita duos Chriſtos exiſtere, quem unum eſſe, & unam ipſius perſonã omnes citra omnem controverſiam agnoſcunt.

And this is all which theſe *Gentlemen* offer to make good their Aſſertion, that the Deity of Chriſt *is repugnant to Right Reaſon*; which therefore upon what ſmall *pretence* they have done, will quickly appeare.

1. It is true, that there cannot be ſuch a *perſonall* uniting of two *ſubſtances* with ſuch diverſe Properties, ſo as by that Union to make an Exequation, or an *equalling* of thoſe diverſe properties; but that there may not be ſuch a concurrence, and meeting of ſuch different ſubſtances in one Perſon, both of them preſerving entire to themſelves their *eſſentiall* Properties, which are ſo *diverſe*, there is nothing pleaded nor pretended. And to ſuppoſe that there cannot be ſuch an union, is to *begge* the thing in Queſtion, againſt evidence of many expreſſe Teſtimonies of Scripture, without tendering the leaſt inducement for any to *grant* their Requeſts.

2. In calling theſe Properties of the ſeverall natures in Chriſt, *adverſe* or *contrary*, they would inſinuate a conſideration of them *as of Qualities* in a *ſubject*, whoſe mutuall contrariety ſhould prove deſtructive to the *one*, if not both; or by a mixture cauſe an Exurgency of Qualities of another temperature. But neither are theſe properties ſuch Qualities, nor are they inherent in any common ſubject, but inſeparable *Adjuncts* of the different natures of Chriſt, never mixed with one another, nor capable of any ſuch thing to Eternity, nor ever becoming properties of the other nature, which they belong not unto, though all of them do denominate the Perſon, wherein both the natures do ſubſiſt. So that inſteed of pleading *Reaſon*, which they pretended they would, they do nothing in this firſt part of their Anſwer, but *begge* the thing in Queſtion; which being of ſo much importance, and concernment to our Soules, is never like to be granted them on any ſuch termes. Will, Chriſt on their entreaties, ceaſe to be God?

Neither

Neither is their Second pretended Argument of any other
§. 10. kind. We deny, that the Humane Nature of Christ had any such subsistence of its own, as to give it a *proper personality*, being from the time of its Conception, assumed into *subsistence* with the Son of God. This we prove by expresse Texts of Scripture, *Isa:*7.14. *Chap:* 9.6. *Ioh.*1.14. *Rom:* 1.3. *Chap.* 9. 5. *Heb.* 2.15. *Luk.*1.35. *Heb.*9.14. *Act.* 3.15. *Act.*20.28. *Phil.*2.7. 1 *Cor.*2. 8. *&c.* And by Arguments taken from the assigning of all the diverse Properties by them mentioned before, and sundry others, to the same person of Christ, &c. That we would take it for granted, that this cannot be, is the modest *Request* of these *Gentlemen* with whom we have to do.

§. 11. 2. If by *natures constituting Persons*, they meane those, who antecedently to their union, have actually done so, we grant they cannot meet in one Person; so that upon this union they should cease to be two Persons. The personality of either of them being destroyed, their different Beings could not be preserved. But if by *constituting*, they understand only that which is so in *potentia*, or a *next possibility* of constituting a Person; then, as before, they only begge of us, that we would not believe, that the *Person* of the *Word* did assume the *humane nature* of Christ, that *holy thing, that was borne of the Virgin*, into subsistence with it selfe; which for the Reasons before mentioned, and others like to them, we cannot grant.

§. 12. And this is the substance of all that these men plead, and make a noyse with in the world, in an opposition to the Eternall Deity of the Sonne of God. This *Pretence* of Reason, (which evidently comes short of being any thing else) is their shield & buckler in the cause they have unhappily undertaken. When they tell us of Christs being *hungry*, and *dying*, we say, it was in the humane nature, wherein he was obnoxious to such things no lesse then we, being therein *made like unto us in all things, sinne only excepted.* When of his *submission and subjection* to his Father, we tell them it is in respect of the *Office* of Mediatour, which he willingly undertook; and that his *Inequality* unto him, as to that Office, doth noe way prejudice his *Equality* with him, in respect of his nature and Being. But when with Scriptures, and Arguments from thence, as cleare and convincing, as if they were written with the *beames of the Sunne*,

we

we prove our deare Lord Jesus in respect of a divine nature whereof he was partaker from Eternity, to be God blessed for ever: they tell us it cannot be, that two such diverse natures, as those of God and man, should be united in one person: and it cannot be so, because it cannot be so, there is no such union among other things. And these *things must be*, that those who are *approved may be tryed*: but let us heare them out. §. 13.

e *But whereas they shew, that Christ consisteth of a Divine and humane nature, as a man consisteth of soule and body, what is to be answered them?*

e *Cum vero illi ostendunt, Christum sic ex natura divina & humana constare, quemadmodum homo ex animo & corpore constet, quid illis respondendum?*

A. "That here is a very great difference. For they say, that the two natures "in Christ are so united, that Christ is both "God and Man. But the soule and body "are in that manner conjoyned in man, "that a man is neither soule nor body, "nor neither soule nor body do singly "of themselves constitute a person. But as "the divine nature by its selfe constitutes "a person, so it is necessary that the hu-"mane nature should do.

Permagnum hic esse discrimen: illi enim aiunt, duas naturas in Christo ita unitas esse, ut Christus sit Deus & homo; anima vero & corpus ad eum modum in homine conjuncta sunt, ut nec anima, nec corpus ipse homo sit, nec enim anima, nec corpus sigillatim personam constituunt. At ut natura divina per se constituit personam, ita humana constituat' perse, necesse est.

1. *R.* In what sence it may be said, that Christ, that is, the *Person of Christ*, consisteth of a divine & humane nature, was before declared. The *Person* of the Sonne of God assumed the *Humane Nature* into subsistence with it selfe, and both, in that one Person are Christ.

2. If our *Catechists* have no more to say to the illustration given to the Union of the *two Natures* in the Person of Christ, by that of the soule and body in one humane person, but that there is a *great difference* in something btween them, they doe but *filch* away the *graines* that are allowed to every similitude; and shew wherein the *comparats* differ, but answer not to that wherein they do agree.

3. All that is intended by this *similitude*, is to shew, that besides the change of things, one into another, either by the losse of one, as of *water into wine* by Christ, and besides the *Union* that is in *Physicall Generation* by mixture, whereby, and from whence, some *third* thing ariseth, that also there is a *substantiall union*,

whereby one thing is not *turned* into another, nor mixed with it. And the end of using this *similitude*, (which to please our *Catechists* we can forbeare, acknowledging, that there is not among created beings any thing that can fully represent this, which we confesse *without controversy to be a great mystery*) is only to manifest the folly of that assertion of their Master on *Joh.* 1. that if the *word be made flesh* in our sence, it must be turned into flesh; for saith he, one thing cannot be *made* another, but *by change, conversion, and mutation into it*. The Absurdity of which assertion is sufficiently evinced, by the substantiall union of *soule and body*, made one person, without that alteration and change of their natures which is pleaded for. Neither is the *word* made flesh by *Alteration*, but by Union.

4. It is confessed, that the *soule* is not said to be *made* the body, nor the body said to be *made* the soule, as the *word* is said to be *made flesh*; for the union of soule and body, is not an union of distinct substances, subsisting in one common *subsistence*, but a union of *two* parts of one nature, whereof the one is the forme of the other. And herein is the *dissimilitude* of that *similitude*. Hence will that *predication* be justified in Christ; the *word was made flesh*, without any change or alteration, because of that subsistence whereunto the *flesh*, or *humane nature* of Christ was assumed, which is common to them both. And so it is in *accidentall* predications. When we say a *man is made white, black, or pale*, we do not intend that He is, as to his *substance*, changed into *whitenesse &c.* but that he who is a *man*, is also become *white*.

5. It is true that the *soule* is not a person, nor the body; but a Person is the *Exurgency* of their conjunction; and therefore we do not say, that herein the similitude is urged; for the divine nature of Christ had its own *personality* antecedent to this union: nor is the union of his Person, the union of severall parts of the same nature, but the Concurrence of severall natures in one subsistence.

6. That 'tis of necessity that Christs *humane nature should of its selfe constitute a person*, is urged upon the old account of begging the thing in question. This is that which in the case of Christ we deny; & produce all the proofes before mentioned to make evident the Reason of our denyall. But our great *Masters*

here,

here, say the contrary; and our *under-Catechists* are resolved to believe them. Christ was a *true man*, because he had the true *Essence* of a man, soule and body, with all their essentiall properties. A peculiar personality belongeth not to the essence of a man, but to his existence in *such* a manner. Neither do we deny Christ to have a *person, as a Man*, but an *humane Person*. For the humane nature of Christ *subsisteth* in that, which though it be in it selfe divine, yet as to that act of sustentation, which it gives the humane nature, it is the subsistence of a man. On which account the *subsistence* of the humane nature of Christ is made more *noble* and *excellent*, then that of any other man whatever. And this is the whole plea of our *Catechists* from Reason, that whereto they so much pretend, and which they give the preheminence unto, in their attempts against the Deity of Christ, as the chiefe, if not the only, engine they have to work by. And if they be thus *weake* in the *maine body* of their *forces*, certainly that reserve which they pretend from Scripture, whereof indeed they have the meanest *pretence* and shew, that ever any of the sonnes of men had, who were necessitated to make a plea from them, in a matter of so great concernment, as that now under consideration, will quickly disappeare. Thus then they proceed.

Q. [f] *Declare also, how it is repugnant to Scripture, that Christ hath a divine nature.*

A. "First, because that the Scripture propo-
"seth to us, one only God by nature, whom we
"have above declared to be the Father of Christ.
"Secondly, the same Scripture testifieth, that Je-
"sus Christ was by nature a man, whereby it ta-
"keth from him any divine nature. 3. Because
"what ever divine thing Christ hath, the Scrip-
"ture plainly teacheth that he had it by a gift of
"the Father; *Mat.*28.18. *Phil.*2.9. 1 *Cor.*15. 27.
"*Ioh.*5.19. 10.25. Lastly, because the same Scrip-
"ture most evidently shewing, that Jesus Christ
"did not vindicate and ascribe all his divine
"works to himselfe, or to any divine nature of
"his own, but to his Father, makes it plaine, that

[f] *Doce etiam, qui id repugnet Scripturæ, Christum habere divinam naturam.*

Primum, eâ ratione, quod Scriptura nobis unum tantum naturâ Deum proponat, quem superius demonstravimus esse Christi patrem. Secundo, eadem Scriptura testatur, Jesum Christum naturâ esse hominem, ut superius ostensum est; quo ipso, illi naturam adimit divinam. Tertio, quod quicquid divinum Christus habeat, Scriptura eum patris dono habere aperte doceat, Math.28.18. Phil.2. 9. 1 Cor. 15. 27. Iohn.5. 19. 10.25 *Deniq; cum eadem Scriptura apertissimè*

that

"that divine nature in Christ was altogether in "vaine, and would have been without any "cause.

offendat, Jesum Christum omnia sua facta divina non sibi, nec alicui naturæ divinæ suæ; sed patri suo vindicare solitum fuisse, planum facit, eam divinam in Christo naturam prorsus otiosam, ac sine omni causâ futuram fuisse.

And this is that which our Catechists have to pretend from Scripture against the Diety of Christ, concluding, that any such divine nature in him would be *superfluous and needlesse*, themselves being Judges. In the strength of what here they have urged, they set themselves to evade the Evidence of neare *fifty expresse Texts of Scripture*, by themselves produced, and insisted on, giving undeniable Testimony to the truth they oppose. Let then what they have brought forth be briefly considered.

§. 15. 1. The Scripture doth indeed propose unto us *one only God by nature*, and we confesse, that that only true God, is the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*; but we say, that the Sonne is partaker of the Fathers nature, of the same nature with him, as being his *proper Sonne*, and by his own Testimony *one with him*. He is such a Son, (as hath been declared) as is begotten of the *Essence* of his Father, and is therefore *God blessed for ever*. If the Father be God by nature, so is the Sonne, for he is of the same nature with the Father.

2. To conclude that Christ is not *God*, because he is *man*, is plainly and evidently to *begge* the thing in Question. We evidently demonstrate in the person of Christ, Properties that are *inseperable Adjunctis* of a divine nature, and such also, as no lesse properly belong to an humane nature: from the asserting of the one of these, to conclude to a deniall of the other, is to *beg* that which they are not able to *digge* for.

3. There is a twofold communication of the Father to the Sonne; 1. By *Eternall Generation*, so the Sonne receives his *personality*, and therein his Divine nature, from him, who said unto him, *Thou art my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee*: and this is so farre from disproving the Deity of Christ, that it abundantly confirmes it: and this is mentioned, *Iob*: 5. 19, 20, 21, 22. This Christ hath by nature. 2. By Collation of *Gifts*, *Honour* and *Dignity*, *Exaltation*, and *Glory* upon him as Mediatour, or in respect of that Office, which he humbled himselfe to undergoe, and

and for the full execution whereof, an investiture with Glory, Honour, and Power, was needfull, which is mentioned, *Matth:* 28.18. *Phil:*2.9. 1 *Cor:*15.27. which is by no means derogatory to the *Deity* of the Sonne; for *inequality* in respect of Office is well consistent with *Equality* in respect of nature. This Christ hath by Grace. *Mat.* 28.18. Christ speaks of himselfe as throughly furnished with *Authority*, for the accomplishing of the worke of *Mediation*, which he had undertaken. It is of his Office, not of his Nature, or Essence that he speaks. *Phil:* 2.9. Christ is said to be *exalted*, which he was in respect of the *Reall* Exaltation given to his Humane Nature, and the manifestation of the *Glory* of his Divine, which he had with his Father before the World was, but had eclipsed for a season: 1 *Cor:*15.27. relates to the same Exaltation of Christ as before.

4. It is false, that Christ doth not ascribe the *divine workes* which he wrought, to himselfe, and his own *divine* Power, although that he often also make mention of the Father, as by whose Appointment he wrought those workes, as Mediator. *Ioh.* 5.17. *My Father worketh hitherto, and I worke*; v. 19. *For whatsoever things the Father doth, these also doth the Sonne*: v.21. *For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickneth them, even so the Sonne quickneth whom he will.* Himselfe wrought the workes that he did, though as to the End of his working them, which belonged to his Office of Mediation, He still relates to his Fathers *designation* and *appointment*. And this is the whole of our *Catechists* plea from *Reason*, and *Scripture* against the Deity of Christ. For the conclusion of the *superfluousnesse, and needlessnesse of such a Divine Nature in the Mediator*, as it argues them to be ignorant of the Scripture, and of the Righteousnesse of God, and the nature of sinne, so it might administer occasion to insist upon the demonstration of the necessity which there was, that he who was to be *Mediatour between God and man*, should be *both God and Man*; but that I aime at brevity, and the consideration of it may possibly fall in upon another account; so that here I shall not insist thereon.

§. 16. Nextly then, they addresse themselves to that which is their *proper work*, (wherein they are exceedingly delighted) *viz.* in giving in *exceptions* against the Testimonies produced for the confirmation of the Truth under consideration, which they thus enter upon.

g *Atqui illi e Scripturis illam divinam in Christo naturam asserere conantur?*

Conantur quidem variis modis; idq; dum student, aut e Scripturis quibusdam evincere, quæ in iis non habentur, aut dum ex iis, quæ in Scripturis habentur, perperam ratiocinantur, ac male rem suam conficiunt.

g But they endeavour to assert the Divine Nature of Christ from the Scriptures.

A. They endeavour it indeed diverse waies; and that whilest they study, either to evince out of certain Scriptures what is not in them, or whilest they argue perversely from these things which are in the Scriptures, and so evilly bring their businesse to passe.

These it seemes are the general heads of our Arguments for the Deity of Christ: but before we part we shall bring our *Catechists* to another reckoning: and manifest, both that what we assert is expresly contained in the Scriptures, and what we conclude by *Ratiocination* from them, hath an evidence in it, which they are not able to resist. But they say,

§. 17.

h Q. *What are those things which they labour to evince concerning Christ out of the Scriptures, which are not contained in them?*

A. "Of this sort is (as they speake) his "preeternity, which they endeavour to "confirme with two sorts of Scriptures. "1. Such as wherein they suppose this pre-"eternity is expressed. 2. Such as where-"in though it be not expressed, yet they "think that it may be gathered from them.

h *Quæ vero sunt illa, quæ illi de Christo e Scripturis evincere laborant quæ illic non habentur?*

Est illius, ut loquuntur, præternitas, quam duplici Scripturarum genere approbare nituntur. Primum ejusmodi est, in quo præternitatem hanc expressam putant. Secundum, in quo licet expressa non sit, eam tamen colligi arbitrantur.

That we do not only *suppose*, but have also as great *an Assurance* as the plaine, evident, and redoubled Testimony of the Holy Ghost can give us, of the Eternity of Jesus Christ, shall be made evident in the ensuing Testimonies, both of the one sort and the other; especially such as are expresse thereunto; for in this matter we shall very little trouble the Reader with collections and arguings, the matter enquired after being expresse and evident in the words, and termes of the Holy Ghost him-

§. 18. selfe. They say then.

i Q. *Which are those Testimonies of Scripture which seeme to them to expresse his preeternity?*

A. "They are these, in which the Script-"ture witnesseth of Christ, that he was in the

i *Quænam sunt Testimonia Scripturæ, quæ videntur ipsis eam præternitatem exprimere?*

Sunt ea, in quibus Scriptura testa-

" the beginning, that he was in Heaven, that " he was before *Abraham*, *Ioh.* 1. 1. *Ioh.* 6. 62. " *Ioh.* 8. 58.

tur de Christo, ipsum fuisse in principio, fuisse in cœlo, fuisse ante Abrahamum, Io. 1. 1. Io. 6. 62. Io. 8. 58.

Before I come to the consideration of the particular places propoſed by them to be inſiſted on, I ſhall deſire to premiſe *one* or *two* things. As

1. That it is ſufficient for the diſproving of their *hypotheſis* concerning Chriſt, if we prove him to have been *exiſtent* before his Incarnation, whether the Teſtimonies whereby we prove it, reach expreſsly to the proofe of his Eternity or no. That which they have undertaken to maintaine, is, *that Chriſt had no exiſtence before his conception*, and birth of the Virgin: which if it be diſproved, they *do* not, they *cannot* deny, but that it muſt be on the account of a *divine nature*; for as to the Incarnation of any preexiſting creature, (which was the *Arians* madneſſe) they diſavow, and oppoſe it.

2. That theſe *three* places mentioned, are very farre from being *all*, wherein there is expreſſe confirmation of the *Eternity* of Chriſt: and therefore when I have gone through the conſideration of them, I ſhall adde ſome *others* alſo, which are of no leſſe evidence and perſpicuity then *theſe*, whoſe vindication we are by them called unto.

To the firſt place mentioned they thus proceed. §. 19.

i *What doſt thou anſwer to the firſt?*

" In the place cited, there is nothing a- " bout that preeternity, ſeeing here is menti- " on of the beginning, which is oppoſed to " Eternity. But the word beginning is almoſt " alwayes in the Scripture referred to the " ſubject matter, as may be ſeen, *Dan.* 8. 1. " *Joh.* 15. 27. 16. 4. *Act.* 11. 15. And there- " fore ſeeing the ſubject matter here, is the " Goſpell, whoſe deſcription *John* under- " takes, without doubt, by this word *be-* " *ginning*, *John* underſtood the beginning of " the Goſpell.

k *Quid vero ad primum reſpondes?*

In loco citato nihil habetur, de iſta præternitate, cum hic principii mentio fiat, quod præternitati opponitur. Principii vero vox in Scripturis fere ſemper ad ſubjectam refertur materiam, ut videre eſt, Dan. 8. 1. Joh. 15. 27. 16. 4. Act. 11. 15. *cum igitur hic ſubjecta ſit materia Evangelium, cujus deſcriptionem ſuſcepit Joannes, ſine dubio per vocem hanc principii, principium Evangelii Joannes intellexit.*

This place being *expreſſe* to our purpoſe, and the matter of great *importance*, I ſhall firſt confirme the truth contended for, from

from thence, and then remove the miserable subterfuge, which our *Catechists* have received from their great Apostles, *Uncle* and *Nephew*.

Irenæus ad hæres. lib. 3. c. 11. *Epiphan.* lib. 1. Tom. 2. hæres. 27, 28, 30, &c. lib. 2. Tom. 2. Hæres. 69. *Theodoret.* Epitom. Hæret. lib. 2.

1. That *John* thus expressly insisting on the *Deity of Christ*, in the beginning of his Gospell, intended to disprove and condemne sundry that were risen up in those dayes, denying it, or asserting the *Creation*, or making of the world to another *Demiurgus*, we have the unquestionable Testimony of the first *Professors* of the Religion of Jesus Christ, with as much evidence and cleareness of Truth as any thing can be tendred on uncontroled Tradition: which at least will give some insight into the intendment of the Holy Ghost in the words.

Euseb. Histor. lib. 3. c. 27. *Causam post alios hanc scribendi præcipuam tradunt omnes (veteres) ut veneno in Ecclesiam jam tum sparso, autoritate sua, quæ apud omnes Christianum nomen profitentes, non poterat non esse maxima, medicinã faceret.* Grot. Præfat. ad Annotat. in Evang. Joan.

2. That by ὁ λόγος, howsoever rendred, *verbum* or *sermo*, or on what account soever he be so called, either of being the *eternall Word and Wisdome* of the Father, or as the great *Revealer* of his will unto us, (which yet of it selfe is not a sufficient cause of that Appellation, for others also reveale the will of God unto us, *Act.* 20. 27. *Heb.* 1. 1.) Jesus Christ is intended, is on all hands confessed, and may be undenyably evinced from the Context. This ὁ λόγος, *came into the world*, and was rejected by his *own* v. 11: yea expressly he was *made flesh*, and was the *only begotten Sonne of God*, v. 14.

3. That the whole of our Argument from this place, is very farre from consisting in that Expression, *in the beginning*, though that, relating to the matter whereof the Apostle treates, doth evidently evince the truth pleaded for. It is part of our *Catechists* trade, so to *divide* the words of Scripture, that their maine import and tendence, may not be perceived. In one place they answer to the first words, in the *beginning*: in another to, he *was with God*, and *he was God*; in a third to that, *all things were made by him*; in a fourth, (all at a great distance one from another) to, *the Word was made flesh*: Which desperate course of proceeding, argues that their cause is also desperate, and that they durst not meet this one Testimony as by the Holy Ghost placed and ordered for the confirmation of our Faith, without

without such a bold mangling of the Text, as that instanced in.

§. 20. 4. I shall then insist upon the whole of this Testimony, as the words are placed in their Contexture by the Holy Ghost, and vindicate them from what in severall places they have excepted against severall parcels of them. Thus then from these words, (these divine words (whose very reading reclaimed as eminent a *Schollar* as the world enjoyed any in his dayes, from *Atheisme*) we proceed.

Novum Testamentum divinitus oblatum aperio, aliud agenti exhibet se mihi adspectu primo augustissimum illud caput Johannis Evangelistæ & Apostoli. In principio erat verbum. *Lego partem capitis, & ita commovear legens, ut repente divinitatem Argumenti, & scripti majestatem, autoritatemq; senserim, longo intervallo omnibus eloquentiæ humanæ viribus præeuntem. Herrebat corpus: stupebat animus, & totum illum diem sic afficiebar, ut qui essem, ipse mihi incertus viderer esse.* Francisc. Junius.

1. He that *was in the beginning*, before the creation of the world, before *any thing*, or all things that *are made*, *was made*, Who was *then with God*, *and was God*, Who *made all things*, *and without whom nothing was made*, in whom *was Life*, He is *God* by nature blessed for ever; nor is there in the whole Scripture a more glorious, and eminent description of God, by his Attributes, name, and Workes, then here is given of him concerning whom all these things are spoken; but now all this is expressly affirmed of the *Word that was made flesh*, that is confessedly of *Iesus Christ*, therefore he is God by nature blessed for ever. Unto the *severall* parts of this plaine and evident Testimony, in *severall* places they except *severall* things, thinking thereby to evade that strength and Light, which each part yeilds to other, as they lye, and all of them to the whole; I shall consider them in order as they come to hand.

§. 21. 1. Against that expression, *in the beginning*, they except in the place mentioned above, that it doth not *signify preeternity*, *which hath no beginning*. But

1. This imped's not at all the *Existence* of Jesus Christ before the *Creation*, although it denys, that his Eternity is expressly asserted. Now to affirme, that Christ did *exist* before the whole Creation, and *made all things*, doth no lesse prove him to be *no more a Creature*, but the Eternall God, then the most expresse Testimony of his Eternity doth, or can do.

2. Though Eternity have no *beginning*, and the sence of these words cannot be, in *the beginning of Eternity*, yet Eternity is before all things, and *in the beginning* may be the description of *Eternity*, as it is plainly, *Prov.* 8. 23. *From everlasting, and in the beginning before the Earth was*, are of the same import. And the Scripture saying, that *in the beginning the word was*, not, *was made*, doth as evidently expresse Eternity, as it doth in those other phrases, of, *before the world was*, or *before the foundation of the world*, which more then once it insists on. Joh. 17. 5.

3. By *in the beginning*, is intended before the *Creation of all things*. What will it availe our *Catechists*, if it doth not expresly denote Eternity? Why, the *word beginning is to be interpreted variously, according to the subject matter spoken of, as Gen.* 1. 1. *which being here the Gospell, it is the beginning of the Gospell that is intended.* But

1. Be it agreed, that the word *beginning* is to be understood according to *the subject matter*, whereunto it is applyed; that the Apostle doth *firstly*, and *nextly* treat of the *Gospell*, as to the season of its preaching, is most absurd. He treats evidently and professedly of the *Person* of the Author of the Gospell, of the *Word* that was *God*, and was made flesh. And that this cannot be wrested to the sence intended, is cleare; For 1. the Apostle evidently alludes to the first words of *Genesis*: *in the beginning God created Heaven and earth*: and the *Syriack Translatour* from the *Hebrew*, here places בְּשׁוּרִין: so here, in the *beginning the word made all things*. 2. The following words, the *word was with God*, manifests the intendment of the Holy Ghost to be, to declare *what*, and where the *Word*, was, before the Creation of the world, even *with God*. 3. The Testimony that he *was God in the beginning*, will no way agree with this glosse: take his *being God* in *their* sence, yet they deny, that he was God *in the beginning* of the Gospell, or *before his suffering*, as hath been shewed. 4. The sence given by the *Socinians* to this place is indeed senseless. *In the beginning* (say they) that is, *when the Gospell began to be preached by John Baptist*, (which is plainly said to be, before the world was made) *the word, or the man Jesus Christ* (the Word being afterwards said to be made *flesh*, after this whole description of him, as the Word) *was with God*; so hidden, as that he was known only to God, (which is *false*, for he was known to his *Mother*, to *Joseph*, to *John Baptist*,

to

to *Simeon*, *Anna*, and to others) and *the word was God*, that is, *God appointed, that he should be so afterwards, or made God* (though it be said, he was God, then, when he was with God) and *all things* were made by him; the *new Creature was made by him*, or the world by his preaching, and teaching, and working Miracles was made, or *reformed*; (that is, *something was mended by him*,) such Interpretations we may at any time be supplyed withall at an easy rate. 5. To view it a little farther. *In the beginning*, that is, *when John preached Jesus, and said, behold the Lamb of God; was the word*; or Jesus was, that is, He was, when *John preached* that he was: *egregiam vero laudem!* He was, when he was. *The word was in the beginning*: that is, Jesus was flesh and bloud, and then was afterwards *made flesh*, and *dwelt amongst us*, when he had dwelt amongst us. And this is that interpretation which *Faustus Socinus* receiving from his Uncle *Lælius* first set up upon; in the strength whereof he went forth unto all the Abominations which afterwards he so studiously vented.

§. 22. Passing by those two weighty & most material passages of this Testimony, *the word was God*, and the *word was with God*, the one evidencing his *oneness of nature* with, and the other his *distinctness* of Personality from his Father, our *Catechists* after an interposition of neare 20 *pages*, fix upon the 3. *verse*, and attempt to pervert the expresse words and intendment of it, having cut it off from its dependance on what went before, that evidently gives light into the aime of the Holy Ghost therein: their words concerning this verse are;

b *Declare to me with what Testimonies they contend to prove, that Christ created the Heavens and the Earth?*

"With those, where it is written, that by him "all things, and without him was nothing "made, that was made, and the world was "made by him: *Joh.* 1. 3, 10. as also *Col.* 1. 16. *Heb.* 1. 2. and 10, 11, 12. *verses.*

But how dost thou answer to the first Testimony?

1. "It is not in the first Testimony: they "were created, but they were made. 2. *John* "saies, they were made by him; which manner "of speaking doth not expresse him, who is "the first cause of any thing, but the second or "mediate cause. Lastly, the word al things, is

b *Expone igitur mihi, quibus testimoniis approbare contendunt, Christum cælum & terram creasse?*

Iis, ubi scriptum extat, quod per eum omnia facta sint, & sine eo factū sit nihil, quod factū sit, Joh. 1. 3. *& iterum, mundus per ipsū factus est,* v. 10. *& rursus, quod in eo omnia sunt condita &c.* Col. 1. 16. *Et quod Deus per eum sæcula fecerit,* Heb. 1. 2. *denique & ex eo, tu in principio, &c.* v. 10, 11, 12.

Qui vero ad primum Testimonium respondes?

Primum, non habetur in prim. testimonio creata sunt, verūm fa-

cta sunt. Deinde, ait Joannes, facta esse per eum; qui modus loquendi, non eum, qui prima causa sit alicujus rei, verum causam secundam aut mediam exprimit. Deniq; vox omnia *non pro omnibus prorsus rebus hic sumitur, sed ad subjectam materiam restringitur omnino, quod frequentissimum est in libris divinis, præsertim Novi Testamenti, cujus rei exemplum singulare extat,* 2 Cor. 5. 17. *in quo habetur sermo de re, huic, de qua Johannes tractat, admodum simili, ubi dicitur, omnia ova facta esse; cum certum sit multa extare, quæ nova facta non sunt. Cum vero subjecta apud Ioannem materia sit* Evangelium, *apparet vocem* omnia, *de iis omnibus, quæ quoque modo ad Evangelium pertinent, accipi debere.*

Cur vero addidit Ioannes, quod sine eo factum est nihil, quod factum est?

Addidit hæc Ioannes, ut eo melius illustraret illa superiora, omnia per ipsum facta sunt, *quæ eam vim habere videntur, per solum Verbum vel Filium Dei omnia illa facta esse, licet ejus generis quædam, & quidem magni momenti, non per ipsum, verum per Apostolos facta fuerint: ut est vocatio Gentium, & legalium ceremoniarum abolitio; licet enim hæc originem ab ipsis sermonibus & operibus Domini Iesu traxerint, ad effectum tamen non sunt perducta per ipsum Christum, sed per ipsius Apostolos, non tamen sine ipso. Apostoli enim omnia nomine, & authoritate ipsius administrarunt, ut etiam ipse Dominus ait, sine me nihil facere potestis.* Joan. 15. 5.

"not taken for all things universally, but is altogether related to the subject matter, which "is most frequent in the Scriptures, especially "of the new Testament, whereof there is a "singular example, 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. Wherein there "is a discourse of a thing very like to this, "whereof *John* treates, where it is said, all things "are made new; when as it is certaine, that there "are many things which are not made new: "Now whereas the subject matter in *John* "is the Gospell, it appeareth, that this "word all things, is to be received only of all "those things which belong to the Gospell?

But why doth John adde, that without him nothing was made, that was made?

"*John* added these words, that he might the "better illustrate those before spoken, all things "were made by him; which seeme to import, "that all those things were made by the word, "or Sonne of God, although some of them, "and those of great moment, were of such sort, "as were not done by him, but the Apostles. "As the calling of the Gentiles, the abolishing "of Legall ceremonies. For although these "things had their originall from the preaching, "and workes of the Lord Jesus, yet they were "not perfected by Christ himselfe, but by his "Apostles; but yet not without him. For the "Apostles administred all things in his name, "& authority, as the Lord himselfe said, with-"out me ye can do nothing, *Ioh.* 15. 5.

§. 24. Thus to the 3. *verse*, of which afterwards. We shall quickly see how these men are put to their shifts, to escape the sword of this witnesse, which stands in the way *to cut them off* in their journying to curse the Church and People of God, by denying the Deity of their blessed Saviour.

1. The Connexion of the words is wholly omitted, *He was God*

God, and he was in the beginning with God, and all things were made by him. The words are an illustration of his divine nature, by his divine power and workes: He was God, and he made *all things*. He that made all things is God: *Heb.* 3. 4. *The Word made all things, Joh.* 1. 3. therefore he is God. Let us see what is answered.

1. *It is not said, they were created by him, but made.* But the word here used by *John*, is the same, that in sundry places the *Septuagint* (whom the writers of the New Testament followed) used about the creation. As *Gen.* 1. 3. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς γενηθήτω φῶς. καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς. and *v.* 16. ἐγένετο στερέωμα: and if, as it is affirmed, he was in the Beginning (*before* all things) and *made* them all, he made them out of nothing; that is, he *created* them. To *create* is but to produce *something* out of nothing, Nothing supplying the *terme from whence* of their production. But §. 25.

2. *They are said to be made by him*: its δι' αὐτοῦ, *which denotes not the principall, but mediate, or instrumentall cause.*

But it is most evident, that these men *care not what* they say, so they may say *something*, that they think will trouble them whom they oppose.

1. This might helpe the *Arians*, who fancyed Christ to be *created*, or made before all other things; and to have been the *instrumentall cause*, whereby God created all other things; but how this concernes them to insist on, who deny that Christ had any Existence at all, before the world was some thousands of yeares old, is not easy to be apprehended.

2. In their own sence this is not to the purpose, but expressly contradictory to what they offer in the last place, by way of answer to the latter part of the third verse. Here they say, *He is not the principall efficient cause*, but the second, and mediate: there, that all things were either *done* by him, or in his *Name*, & *Authority*: which certainly denotes the principall cause of the thing done. But

3. This very expression is sundry times used concerning God the *Father himselfe*, whom our *Catechists* will not therefore deny to have been the principall efficient cause of the things ascribed to him: *Rom.* 11. 36. from him, & δι' αὐτοῦ *by him* are all things 1 *Cor.* 1. 9. God is faithfull δι' ὃν, *by whom* you are called: *Gal.* 1. 1. *Paul* an Apostle, not of men, nor by man, but διὰ

Ιησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, *by Iesus Christ, and God* the Father *Ephes.* 1.1. διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, *by the will of God*: So that this also is frivolous: thus far we have nothing to the purpose. But

4. *All things, are to be referred to the Gospell; all things of the Gospell whereof Iohn treats: so are the words to be restrained by the subject matter:* but

1. This is meerely *begged*: *Iohn* speakes not one word of the *Gospell*, as such; gives no description of it, its nature, or Effects: but evidently, plainly, and directly speakes of the *Word*, that was *God*, and that made *all things*, describing him in his *Eternity*, his *Workes*, his *Incarnation*, his *Imployment*, his *Comming* into the World and his *businesse*: and treats of the Gospell, or the declaration, of the Will of God by Jesus Christ, distinctly afterwards, from verse 14. and forwards.

§. 26. 2. For the expression, 2 *Cor.* 5.17. *all things are become new*: it is expressely restrained to the *new Creature*, to them *that are in Jesus Christ*; but as to this generall expression here, there is no colour why it should be so restrained. The Expression it selfe every where signifying the Creation of all things; see *Gen.* 2.1, 2. *Psal.* 33.6. *Psal.* 121.2. *Isa.* 37.16. Chap. 44.19. & 62.2. *Jer.* 32.17. *Acts* 14.15. *Act.* 17.24. And this is it, which they plead to the first part of the verse, *by him all things were made*.

§. 27. 2. The other Expression, they say, is added, to manifest, *that what was done after by the Apostles, was not done without him: and that is the meaning of these words, and without him was nothing made, that was made.* But

1. Their πρῶτον ψεῦδος, of referring the whole passage to the description of the *Gospell*, whereof there is not the least tittle, nor intimation in the Text, being removed out of the way, this following figment falls of it selfe.

2. This Glosse is expressely contrary to the Text. The *all things* here mentioned, are the *all things* that were *made* in the *Beginning* of the World; but this Glosse referres it to the things made in the *End* of the World.

3. It is *contradictory* to its selfe; for by the *beginning*, they understand the *beginning of the Gospell*, at the first preaching of it; but the things, that they say here were made by Christ, are things that were done after his Assension.

4. It is true, the Apostles wrought not any miracles, effected

no

no mighty workes, but by the presence of Christ with them, (though the Text cited to prove it *Ioh*: 15. 5. be quite of another importance, as speaking of *Gospell obedience*, not *Workes of Miracles*, or *Conversions*) but that those works of *theirs*, or his by them, are here intended, is not offer'd to proof by our *Catechists*. And this is the sence of the words they give; *Christ, in the beginning of the Gospell, made all things; or all things were made by him; even those, which he made by others, after his Assension into heaven:* or thus: *(All things) that is, some things, (were made) that is, mended, (by him) that is, the Apostles, (in the beginning of the Gospell) that is, after his Assension.*

5. Our sence of the words is *plaine* and *obvious*: saies the Apostle, He *who was in the beginning*, and *was God*, *made all things*; which he first expresseth *positively*; and then by an *universall negative* confirmes, and explaines what was before asserted in an *universall affirmative*, (*without him was nothing made, that was made.*) And this is the summe of what they have to except against this part of our Testimony, then which nothing can be more vaine and frivolous. §. 28.

2. The 10th verse is by them taken under consideration, and these words therein: *The World was made by him*: against which this is their proceedure. §. 29.

What dost thou answer to the second?

1. "That *John* doth not write here, that the "World was Created, but Made. 2. He uses "the same manner of speech, which signifieth "the mediate cause, for he saith, the World "was made by him. Lastly, this word *mundus*, the World, as others of the same import, doe not only denote Heaven and "Earth, but besides other significations, it either signifieth humane kind, as the present "place manifesteth, he was in the World, and "the World knew him not: and *Ioh*. 12. 19. or "also future immortality, as *Heb*: 1. 6. which "is to be understood of the World to come, "as it appears from Chap: 2. where he saith, "he hath not put the world to come into subjection

Quid vero respondes ad secundum?

Primum, quod hic non scribat Johannes, mundum esse creatum, sed factum. Deinde, eo loquendi modo utitur, qui mediam causam designat, ait enim, mundum per eum factum. Deniq; hæc vox mundus, *quemadmodum & aliæ, quæ prorsus idem in Scripturis valent, non solum Cælum & terram donotat, verum præter alias significationes, vel genus humanum designat, ut locus præsens ostendit, ubi ait, In mundo erat, & mundus eum non agnovit*, 1 Ioh. 1. 10. *& mundus eum secutus est*, Ioh. 12. 19. *aut etiam futuram immortalitatem, ut apparet* Heb. 1. 6. *ubi ait, & cum iterum*

"jection

"jection to the Angells, of which we speake:
"but he had no where spoken of it, but Chap.
"1.6. Furthermore you have a place, Chap:
"10. 5. where speaking of Christ he saith:
"wherefore comming into the World, he saith,
"sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not
"have, but a body &c. Where seeing it is evi-
"dent, that he speaks of that world, into
"which Jesus being entred, was made our
"Priest, as all the circumstances demonstrate,
"it appears, that he speaks not of the present,
"but of the world to come, seeing Chap. 8.
"v.4. he had said of Christ, if he were on earth
"he should not be a Priest.

introducit primogenitum in mundum, ait, & adorent eum omnes Angeli Dei; quod de futuro mundo accipi apparet e cap. 2. ejusdem Epistolæ, ubi ait, etenim non Angelis subjecit mundum futurum, de quo loquimur. At nusquam de eo locutus fuerat, nisi v. 6. cap. 1. præterea, habes locum cap: 10. v. 5. ubi de Christo loquens, ait, propterea ingrediens in mundum, ait; hostiam & oblationem noluisti, verum corpus adaptasti mihi; ubi cum palam sit eum loqui de mundo, in quem ingressus Iesus, sacerdos noster factus est, (ut circumstantiæ omnes demonstrant) apparet, non de præsenti, sed de futuro mundo agi, quandoquidem Cap. 8. v. 4, de Christo dixerat, si in terris esset, ne sacerdos quidem esset.

The two First Exceptions have been already cashiered: those which follow are of as little weight or consideration. For

1. It is confessed, that the word *World* hath in Scripture various acceptations; and is sometimes taken for *men in the World*: but that it can be so taken, when the World is said to be *made*, or *created*, when it is *equivalent to all things*, when it is proposed as *a place*, whereunto any *comes*, and where He *is*, as is the state of the Expression here, there can nothing more absurd, or foolish be imagined.

2. *Heb.* 1.6. speaks not of the *World to come*; nor is there any place in the Scripture, where the word *World* doth signify *immortality*, or the World to come, nor any thing looking that way. *Heb.* 2.5. mention is made not *simply* of the World, but of the *World to come*; nor doth that expression of the Apostle relate unto that of Chap. 1.6. where the word *World* is used, but to what goes before, and after in the same Chapter, where the thing it selfe is insisted on, in other termes. Nor is the *future Immortality* intended there by the *world to come*, but the present state of the *Christian Church*, called the *World to come*, in reference to that of the *Jewes*, which was past, in that use of speech, whereby it was expressed before it came; as also Chap. 6.5. Nor is the *world to come*, Life eternall, or blessed immortality; Life is to be had

in

in it; but *immortality*, and the *world to come*, are not the same: nor is that *World* ever said to be *made*; nor is it any where described as *made already*, but as to *come*, as *Matth.* 12.32. *Luk.* 18.30. *Luk.* 20.35. *Eph:* 1.21. nor can it be said of the *world to come*, that it *knew not Christ*, as it is of this that *he made*. Nor can Christ be said to come into that *world* in the *beginning*, which he did not untill after his Resurrection; nor is the *world to come*, that whereof it is said in the next verse, which expounds this, he came εἰς τὰ ἴδια, *to his own*, for then, *his own* οἱ ἴδιοι, *knew him not*: so that there is not the least colour, or pretence of this *foppery*, that here they would evade the Testimony of the Holy Ghost with all.

3. Those words *Heb:* 11.5. *coming into the world he said, &c.* do not in the least intimate any thing of the *world to come*, but expresse the *present world*, into which Christ came, when God prepared a *body for him*, at his *Incarnation*, and *Birth*, which was in order to the sacrifice, which he afterwards offered in this world, as shall be evidently manifested, when we come to the consideration of the *Priesthood* of Christ.

It remaines only that we heare their sence of these words, which they give as followeth. §. 30.

n *But what dost thou understand by these words, the World was made by him?*

" A twofold sence may be given of them; " 1. That humane kind was reformed by " Christ, and as it were made againe, because " he brought life, and that eternall to humane " kind, which was lost, and was subject to e- " ternall death; (which also *John* upbraideth " the World withall, which being vindicated " by Christ from destruction, acknowledged " him not, but contemn'd and rejected him) " for that is the manner of the Hebrew " speech, that in such termes of speaking, the " words, to *make*, and *create*, are as much as " to make againe, or to create againe, because " that tongue wants those words, that are call- " ed compounds. The latter sence is, that that " immortality which we expect, is, as to us,

n *Quid verò per hæc, Mundus per eum factus est, intelligis?*

Duplex eorum sensus dari potest: prior, quod genus humanum per Christum reformatum, & quasi denuo factum sit, eò quod ille generi humano, quod perierat, & æternæ morti subjectum erat, vitam attulit, eam; sempiternam (quod etiam mundo Joannes exprobrat, qui per Christum ab interitu vindicatus, eum non agnoverit, sed spreverit, & rejecerit) Is enim mos Hebraici sermonis, quod in ejusmodi loquendi modis, verba facere, creare, idem valeant, quod denuo facere, & denuo creare, idq; propterea, quod verbis, quæ composita vocant, ea lingua careat. Posterior verò sensus est, quod illa immortalitas, quam expectamus per Christum, quantum ad nos,

facta sit: quemadmodum eadem futurum sæculum, habitâ ratione nostri, vocatur, licet jam Christo & Angelis sit præsens.

"made by Christ; as the same is called the "world to come, in respect of us, although it "be present to Christ, and the Angells.

1. That these expositions are destructive to one another is evident: and yet which of them to adhere unto our *Catechists* know not: such good builders are they, for to establish men in the Faith. Pull down they will, though they have nothing to offer in the roome of what they endeavour to destroy.

2. That the *latter sence* is not intended, was before evinced. The world, that was *made* in the *Beginning*, into which Christ *came*, in which he *was*, which *knew him not*, which is said to be *made*, is a World: is not *immortallity*, or *life eternall*; nor is there any thing in the Context, that should in the least give countenance to such an absurd glosse.

3. Much lesse is the first sence of the words tolerable: for

1. It is expresly contradictory to the Text. He *made the world*; that is, *he reformed it*, and *the world knew him not*; when the world is not *reformed*, but by the *knowledge* of him.

2. To *be made*, doth no where simply signify to be *renewed*, or *reformed*, unlesse it be joyned with other expressions, restraining its significancy to such Renovation.

3. The *world* was not *renewed* by Christ whilst he was *in it*: nor can it be said to be *renewed* by him, only on the account of laying the foundation of its Renovation in his Doctrine. *By him the world was made*, that is, *He preached that Doctrine, whereby some in the world were to be reformed.* The world that Christ made *knew him not*: but the renewed world *know him.*

4. The *Hebraisme* of *making*, for *reforming*, is commonly pretended; without any instance for its confirmation. *John* wrote in *Greeke*, which language abounds with *compositions* above any other in the world, and such as on all occasions he makes use of.

§. 31. There is one passage more, that gives strength to the Testimony insisted on, confirming the existence of Christ in his divine nature, antecedently to his Incarnation, and that is *v.14. The word was made flesh. Who* the *Word* is, and *what*, we have heard.

He

He who *was in the beginning*, who *was God*, and was *with God*, who made *all things*, who made *the world*, in *whom was Light*, *and Life*, He was *made flesh*. Flesh, so as that thereupon he dwelt *amongst men*, and conversed with them. How he was, and how he was said to be made flesh, I have declared in the consideration of his eternall Sonship, and shall not againe insist thereon. This after the interposition of sundry *Questions* our *Catechists* take thus into consideration.

How do they prove Christ to have been incarnate?

"From those Testimonyes, where according "to their translation it is read, *the Word was made* "*flesh*, Joh. 1.14. &c.

How dost thou answer it?

"On this account, because in that Testimony, "it is not said (as they speake) God was incar- "nate, or the divine nature assumed the humane. "The Word was made flesh, is one thing, and "God was Incarnate, or the divine nature assu- "med the humane, another. Besides, these words, "the word was made flesh, or rather, the speech "was made flesh, may, and ought to be rendred, "the word was Flesh. That it may be so rendred, "appeares from the Testimonyes, in which the "word ἐγένετο (which is here translated) *was made*, "is found rendred by the word, *was*: as in this "*chap. v. 6.* and *Luk.* 24. 19. &c. Also that it "ought to be so rendred, the order of *Johns* words "teacheth, who should have spoken very incon- "veniently, the word was made Flesh, that is, as "our *Adversaries* interpret it, the Divine nature as- "sumed the *Humane*, after he had spoken those "things of the word, which followed the nati- "vity of the man Christ Jesus, such as are these: "*John* beare witnesse of him: he came into the "world: he was not received of his own: that

E quibus vero testimoniis Scripturæ demonstrare conantur, Christum (ut loquuntur) incarnatum esse?

Ex iis, ubi secundum eorum versionem legitur, verbum caro factum esse, Jo. 1. 14. & Phil. 2. 6, 7. 1 Tim. 3. 16. *&c.*

Quomodò ad primum respondes?

Eâ ratione, quod in eo Testimonio non habeatur Deum (ut loquuntur) incarnatum esse, aut quod natura divina assumpserit humanam. Aliud enim est, verbum caro factum est, *aliud, Deus incarnatus est, (ut loquuntur) vel natura divina assumpserit humanam. Præterea, hæc verba, verbum caro factum est, vel potius sermo caro factus est, possunt, & debent ita reddi, sermo caro fuit. Posse ita reddi, e testimoniis, in quibus vox ἐγένετο (quæ hic per factum est translata est) verbo fuit reddita invenitur, apparet: ut in eodem Cap. v. 6.* & Luk. 24. 19. *fuit homo missus a Deo, &c. Et, Qui fuit vir, Propheta, &c. Debere vero reddi per verbum fuit, ordo*

verborum Johannis docet, qui valde inconvenienter loquutus fuisset, si mentem carnem factam esse, id est, ut adversarii interpretantur, naturam divinam assumpsisse humanam, postquam ea jam de illo sermone exposuisset, quæ nativitatem hominis Jesu Christi subsecuta sunt; ut sunt hæc: Jo.n-

nem Baptistam de illo testatum esse; illum in mundo fuisse, a suis non fuisse receptum; quod iis, a quibus receptus fuisset, potestatem dederit, ut filii Dei fierent.

" to them that received him, he gave Power to " become the Sonnes of God.

This is the last plea they use in this case; the dying groanes of their perishing cause are in it: which will provide them neither with succour, nor relieſe- For

1. It is not *Words*, or Expressions, that we contend about. Grant the thing pleaded for, and we will not contend with any living about the expressions, wherein it is by any man delivered. By the *Incarnation of the Son of God*, and by the *Divine nature assuming the humane*, we intend no more then what is here asserted, the Word, *who was God, was made flesh.*

2. All they have to plead to the thing insisted on, is, that the word ἐγένετο, *may*, yea ought to be translated, *fuit*, W A S, and not *factus est, was made.* But

1. Suppose it should be translated WAS, what would it availe them? He that *was* a man, was *made* a man. In that sence it expresses what he was, but withall denotes how he came so to be. He who *was* the *Word* before, *was* also a man; let them shew us any other way, how he *became so*, but only by being *made so*, and upon a supposition of this new *Translation*, they may obtaine something. But

2. How will they prove, that so much as it M A Y be rendred by *fuit, was.* They tell you it is so in two other places in the New Testament; but doth that prove that it *may* so much as be so rendred here? The proper sence, and common usage of it, is, *was made*; and because it is once or twice used in a peculiar *sence*, *may* it be so rendred here, where nothing requires, that it be turned aside from its most usuall acceptation; yea much enforcing it thereunto,

3. That it ought to be rendered by *fuit, was*, they plead the mentioning before of things done after Christs *Incarnation* (as we call it,) so that it cannot be, he *was made flesh*: but

1. Will they say, that this order is observed by the Apostle, that that which is first done, is first expressed, as to all particulars? What then becomes of their interpretation, who say the Word was made God by his *Exaltation*, and made *flesh* in his *Humiliation*; and yet how much is that, which in their sence was last, expressed

expressed before that which went before it? Or will they say, in *him was the life of man*, before he was *made flesh?* When the life of man, according to them, depends on his resurrection solely, which was after he ceased to be flesh in their sence. Or what conscience have these men, that in their disputes will object that to the interpretation of others, which they must receive, and imbrace for the establishing of their own?

2. The Order of the words is most proper; *John* having asserted the Deity of Christ, with some generall concomitants and consequences of the dispensation, wherein he undertakes to be a Mediatour; in his 14. *verse* enters particularly upon a description of his entrance upon his Employment, and his carrying it on in, by the Revelation of the Will of God; so that without either difficulty or straining, the sence and intendment of the Holy Ghost falls in clearely in the words. §. 32.

3. It it is evident, that the Word neither *may*, nor ought to to be translated according to their desire. For

1. It being so often said before, that the Word *was*, the Word is still ἦν, and not ἐγένετο: in the beginning the Word *was*, and the Word *was* God, and the Word *was* with God: The same *was*; *he was in the world*, he *was* the light; still the same word; so that if no more were intended, but what was before expressed, the termes would not be changed without exceedingly obscuring the sence; and therefore ἐγένετο must signify somewhat more then ἦν.

2. The word ἐγένετο applyed to other things in this very place, denotes their making, or their Originall, which our *Catechists* did not question in the Consideration of the places where it is so used; as *v.* 3. *all things were made* by him, and without him was nothing *made*, that *was made*, and *v.* 10. *the world was made by him.*

3. This phrase is expounded accordingly in other places; as *Rom.* 1. 3. τῦ γενομένυ ἐκ σπέρματ☉ Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, *made of the seed of David according to the Flesh.* and *Gal.* 4. 4. γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, *made of a woman*; but they think to salve all by the ensuing exposition of these words.

§. 33.

How is that to be understood the word was Flesh?

p Qua ratione illud intelligendum est, Sermonem carnem fuisse.

That

That he by whom God perfectly revealed all his will, who is therefore called sermo *by Iohn, was a man subject to all miseries, and afflictions, and lastly to death it selfe. For the Scripture useth the word Flesh in that sence, as is cleare from those places, where God speakes, my Spirit shall not alwayes contend with man, seeing he is Flesh,* Gen.6. 3. *and Peter, all Flesh is grasse.* 1 Pet. 1, 24.

Quod is, per quem Deus voluntatem suam omnem perfectè exposuisset, & propterea a Joanne Sermo appellatus fuisset, homo fuerit, omnibus miseriis, & afflictionibus, ac morti deniq; subjectus. Etenim vocem caro *eo sensu scriptura usurpat, ut ex iis locis perspicuum est, ubi Deus loquitur:* non contendet spiritus meus cum homine in aternum, *quia caro est,* Gen.6.3. *Et Petrus,* Omnis caro ut fœnum, 1 Pet. 1. 24.

This is the upshot of our Catechists exposition of this first Chapter of *Iohn*, as to the Person of Christ. Which is

1. *Absurd*, upon their own suppositions, for the Testimonies produced affirme *every man to be flesh*; so that to say he is a man, is to say he is flesh: and to say that *man was flesh*, is to say that a *man was a man*, in as much as every man is flesh.

2. *False*, and no way fitted to the intendment of the Holy Ghost; for He was *made Flesh* antecedently to his *dwelling amongst* us; which immediately followes in the Text: Nor is his *being made flesh* suited to any thing in this place, but his conversation with men, which answers his Incarnation, not his mediation; neither is this Exposition confirmed by any instance from the Scriptures, of the like expression used concerning Jesus Christ; as that we urge is, *Rom.* 1. 3. *Gal.* 4. 4. and other places. The place evidently affirmes, *the word to be made something*, that it was not before, when he was the Word only; and cannot be affirmed of him, as he was man; in which sence he was alwayes obnoxious to miseries and death.

§. 34. And this is all which our *Catechists* in severall places have thought meet to insist on, by way of Exception, or opposition to our undeniable, & manifest Testimonies from this first Chap. of *John*, unto the great & sacred truth contended for; which I have at large insisted on, that the Reader from this one instance, may take a taste of their dealing in the rest; and of the *desperateneese* of the cause which they have undertaken, driving them to such desperate shifts, for the maintenance, and protection of it: in the residue I shall be more briefe.

§. 35. *Joh.* 6.62, is in the next place taken into consideration. The words are, *What and if you shall see the Sonne of Man ascend up where he*

he was before. What we intend from hence, and the force of the Argument from this Testimony insisted on, will the better appeare, if we adde unto it those *other* places of Scripture, wherein the same thing is more expressly, and *emphatically* affirmed, which our *Catechists* cast (or some of them) quite into another place, on pretence of the *method* wherein they proceed, indeed to take off from the evidence of the Testimony, as they dealt with what we plead from *John* the first: the places I intend are

Joh. 3. 13. *And no man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Sonne of man, who is in Heaven,*

Vers. 31. *He that cometh from above, is above all. He that cometh from Heaven, is above all.*

John 8. 23. *Ye are from beneath, I am am from above.*

Joh. 16. 28. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; and againe I leave the world, and go to the Father.*

Hence we thus argue. He that *was in Heaven* before he *was on the earth*, & who was *also* in *Heaven, whilst* he was on the earth, is the Eternall God. But this doth Jesus Christ abundantly confirme concerning himselfe; therefore he is the *Eternall God* blessed for ever.

In answer to the first place our Catechists thus proceed. §. 36.

f *What answerest thou to the second Testimony*, Joh. 3. 62.

Neither is here any mention made expressly of preeternity; for in this place the Scripture witnesseth, that the Sonne of man, that is, a man, was in Heaven, who without all controversy was not eternally preexistent. So they.

f *Ad secundum autem quid Respondes?*

Nec; hic ullam præternitatis mentionem factam expresse, nam hoc in loco filium hominis, id est, hominem in cælis fuisse testatur Scriptura, quem citra ullam controversiam præternum non extitisse certum est.

1. It is expressly affirmed, that Christ *was in Heaven*, before his coming into the world. And if we evince his *preexistence* to his Incarnation, against the *Socinians*, the taske will not be difficult to prove that preexistence to be in an *eternall divine nature* against the *Arians*. It is sufficient as to our intendment in producing this Testimony, that it is affirmed, that Christ ἦν ἐν οὐρανῷ in *Heaven*, before his coming forth into the world; in what *nature* we elsewhere prove.

2. It

2. It is said indeed that the *Sonne of man was in Heaven*, which makes it evident, that he *who is the Sonne of man*, hath another nature, besides that wherein he is the Sonne of man, wherein he is the Sonne of God. And by affirming that the *Sonne of man was in Heaven* before, it doth no more assert that he was Eternall, and in Heaven in that *Nature*, wherein he is the Sonne of man, then the Affirmation that *God redeemed his Church with his own Blood*, doth prove, that the blood shed was the *blood of the divine nature*. Both the Affirmations are concerning the Person of Christ. As he who was God, shed his blood as he was man; so he who was man, was *Eternall*, and in Heaven, as *he* was God. So that the Answer doth meerely *begge* the thing in question; *viz. that Christ is not God and man in one person.*

3. The insinuation here of Christs *being in Heaven as man*, before his assention, mentioned in the Scripture, shall be considered, when we come to the proposall made of that figment by M. *Biddle* in his Chapter of the *Propheticall office of Christ*. In answer to the other Testimonyes recited, they thus proceed towards the later end of their Chapter, concerning the Person of Christ.

r *Ubi vero Scriptura de Christo ait, quod de Cælo descendit, a patre exivit, & in mundum venit.* Joh. 3 13. 10. 36. 16. 28. 17. 18. *quid ad hæc respondes?*

Ex iis non probari divinam naturam hinc apparere, quod primi Testimonii verba, descendit de Cælo, *possint figurate accipi, quemadmodum* Jac. 1. v. 17. *Omne datum bonum & donum perfectum desursum est, descendens a patre luminum. &* Apoc. 21. v. 2, 10. *vidi civitatem sanctam, Hierusalem novam, descendentem de Cælo a Deo, &c. Quod si proprie accipi debeant, quod nos perlibenter admittimus, apparet, non de alio illa dicta, quam de filio hominis, qui cum personam humanam necessario*

r *What answerest thou to Joh.* 3. 13. *chap.* 10. 36. *chap.* 16. 28. *chap.* 17. 18.

"That a Divine nature is not here proved, appeareth, because the words of the first Testimony, he came down from Heaven, may be received figuratively, as *Jam.* 1. 17. every good and every perfect gift is from above, and comes down from the Father of lights: and *Revel.* 21. 2, 10. I saw the holy City *Hierusalem* coming down from God. But if the words be taken properly, which we willingly admit, it appeares, that they are not spoken of any other then the Sonne of man, who seeing he hath necessarily an humane Person, he cannot by nature be God; Moreover, for what the Scripture witnesseth of Christ, that the Father sent him into the world, the same we read of the Apostles of Christ in the same words above alleadged: *Joh.* 17. 18. as thou hast sent me in-

"to

"to the world, I have sent them into the world. "And these words, Christ came forth from the "Father, are of the same import with *he descended from Heaven.* To come into the world "is of that sort, as the Scripture manifests to have "been after the Nativity of Christ. *Joh.* 18. 37. "where the Lord himself saves: for this I am "borne, and come into the world, that I might "beare witnesse to the Truth: and 1 *Joh.* 4. 1. It "is written, many false Prophets are gone forth "into the world. Wherefore from this kind of "speaking, a divine nature in Christ cannot be "proved; but in all these speeches only what "was the divine originall of the office of Christ, "is described.

habeat, Deus naturâ esse non potest. Porro, quod Scriptura testatur de Christo, quod Pater eum miserit in mundum, *idem de Apostolis Christi legimus in iisdem verbis citatis superius. Quemadmodum me misisti in mundum, & ego misi eos in mundum* Joh. 17. 18. *Ea vero verba, quod* Christus a patre exierit, *idem valent, quod de cœlo descendit.* Venire vero in mundum, *id ejusmodi est, quod Scriptura post nativitatem Christi extitisse ostendit;* Joh. 18. v. 37. *ubi ipse Dominus ait; Ego in hoc natus sum, & in mundum veni, ut testimonium perhibeam veritati.* Et 1 Joh. 4. 1. *Scriptum est, multos falsos Prophetas exiisse in mundum. Quare ex ejusmodi loquendi modis natura divina in Christo probari non potest. In omnibus vero his locutionibus, quam divinum muneris Christi principium fuerit, duntaxat describitur.*

§. 38. 1. That these expressions are *meerely figuratively* to be expounded, they dare not assert; nor is there any colour given that they may be so received from the instances produced from *James* 1. 17. and *Revel.* 21 2. for there is only mention made of *descending, or comming down,* which word we insist not on by it selfe, but as it is conjoyned with the Testimony of his *being in Heaven* before his *descending;* which takes off all pretence of a parity of Reason in the places compared.

2. All that followes is a perfect *begging* of the thing in question; because Christ is the *Sonne of man,* it followes that he is a *true man*; but not, that he hath the *personality* of a man, or an *humane personality.* Personality belongs not to the *Essence,* but the *Existence* of a man. So that here they do but repeat their own *Hypothesis,* in answer to an expresse Testimony of Scripture against it. Their confession of the proper use of the word, is but to give colour to the figment formerly intimated, which shall be in due place (God assisting) discovered.

3. They utterly omit, and take no notice of that place, where Christ saves, *he so came from Heaven,* as that he was *still in Heaven;* nor do they mention any thing of that, which we lay

greatest weight on, of his affirming that he *was* in Heaven *before*; but merely insist on the word *descending, or comming down*, and yet they can no other way deale with that neither, but by *begging* the thing in question.

4. We do not argue meerely from the words of Christs being *sent into the world*, but in this conjunct consideration, that he was so sent into the world, as that he *was in Heaven before*, and so came forth from the Father, and was with him in Heaven before his comming forth, and this our *Catechists* thought good to oversee.

5. The difference of Christs being sent into the world, and the Apostles by him, which they *paralell*, as to the purpose in hand, lyes in this, that Christ was so *sent* of the Father, that he came *forth from the Father*, and was *with him in Heaven* before his sending, which proves him to have another nature, then that wherein he was sent: the similitude alleadged consists quite in other things. Neither

6. Doth the Scripture in *Joh.* 18.37. testify, that *Christs sending into the world* was after his Nativity, but only that the end of them both, was to beare witnesse to the truth; *And indeed, I was borne, and came into the world*, are but the same, the one being exegeticall of the other. But his being *borne*, & his coming into the world, is in the Testimonies cited, plainely asserted in reference to an *Existence* that he had in Heaven before. And thus as our Argument is not at all touched in this Answer, so is their Answer closed as it began, with the *begging* of that which is not only questioned, but sufficiently disproved, namely, that Christ was in his humane nature *taken up into Heaven*, and instructed in the will of God, before his entrance upon his Propheticall office.

And this is the whole of what they have to except against this evident Testimony of the divine nature of Christ. He was in Heaven, with the Father, before he came forth from the Father, or was sent into the world; and ἐν ἄλλο ἐν ἄλλο, *was in Heaven*, when he *was in the Earth*, and at his Assension returned thither where he was before. And so much for the vindication of this second Testimony.

Ioh. 6. 62. is the second place I can meet with in all the Annotations of *Grotius*, wherein he seemes to assert the union of the

the *humane nature* of Christ with the *eternall word*: if he do so. It is not with the Man that I have any difference, nor do I impose any thing on him for his Judgement; I only take liberty, having so great cause given, to discusse his *Annotations*.

§. 39. There remaines one more of the first *ranke*, as they are sorted by our *Catechists*, for the proofe of the Eternity of Christ, which is also from *John* Chap. 8. 58. *Before Abraham was I am*, That they insist on.

† "In this place the preeternity of Christ is "not only not expressed, being it is one thing to "be before *Abraham*, and another to be eternall, "but also it is not so much as expressed, that he "was before the Virgin *Mary*. For these words "may otherwise be read; namely, verily, verily "I say unto you, before *Abraham* was made I "am; as it appears from those places in the same "Evangelist, where the like Greek phrase is u-"sed, Chap. 13.19.& 14.29.

"What then would be the sence of this rea-"ding? Very eminent. For Christ admonisheth "the Jewes, who would have ensnared him in "his speech, that whilest they had time, they "should believe in him the light of the World, "before the divine grace which Christ offered "to them, should be taken from them, and be "carried to the Gentiles. But that these words, "*I am*, are to be supplied in that manner, as if "himselfe had added to them, *I am* the light of "the World, appears, because that in the be-"ginning of his speech, v:12. he had twice in "these words, *I am*, called himselfe the light of "the World. v:24,25 and that these words, *be-"fore Abraham be*, do signify that which we "have said, may be perceived from the notati-"on of that word *Abraham*; for it is evident, that "*Abraham* notes the Father of many Nations: "seeing then, that *Abram* was not made *Abra-"ham*, before the grace of God, manifested in "Christ, redounded to many Nations, for *Abra-*

† *Hoc in loco non solum non exprimitur præternitas, cum aliud sit, ante Abrahamum fuisse, aliud, præternum; verum ne hoc quidem expressum est, ipsum ante Mariam virginem fuisse. Et enim ea verba aliter legi posse (nimirum hac ratione, Amen, Amen, dico vobis, priusquam Abraham fiat, ego sum) apparet ex iis locis apud eundem Evangelistam, ubi similis & eadem græca locutio habetur, cap. 13.19. & modo dico vobis, priusquam fiat, ut cum factum fuerit credatis. Et cap. 14. 29. & nunc dixi vobis priusquam fiat, &c. Quæ vero ejus sententia foret lectionis? Admodum egregia: etenim admonet Christus Judæos, qui eum in sermone capere volebant, ut dum tempus haberent, crederent ipsum esse mundi lucem, antequam divina gratia, quam Christus iis offerebat, ab iis tolleretur, & ad Gentes transferretur. Quod vero ea verba, ego sum, sint ad eum modum supplenda, ac si ipse subjecisset iis, ego sum lux mundi, supe ius e principio ejusoratio-nis, v. 12. constat & hinc, quod Christus bis seipsum iisdem verbis, Ego sum, lucem mundi vocaverit, v 24,28. Ea vero verba, priusquam Abraham fiat, ad significare quod diximus, e notatione nominis Abraham de-*

prehendi potest; constat inter omnes Abrahamum notare Patrem multarum Gentium. Cum vero Abram non sit factus prius Abraham, quam Dei gratia, in Christo manifestata, in multas gentes redundaret, quippe quod Abrahamus unius tantum gentis antea Pater fuerit, apparet sententiam horum verborum, quam attulimus, esse ipsissimam.

"ham before was the Father of one Nation only, it appears, that that is the very sence of the "words which we have given.

If our Adversaries can well quit themselves of this *Evidence*, I believe they will have no small hopes of escaping in the whole triall. And if they meet with Judges so partially addicted to them, and their cause, as to accept of such manifest jugling, and perverting of the Scriptures, I know not what they may not expect or hope for. Especially, seeing how they exult, and triumph in this invention; as may be seen in the words of *Socinus* himselfe, in his Answer to *Erasmus Johannes* p. 67. For whereas *Erasmus* saies, "I confesse in my whole life, I never "met with any Interpretation of Scripture more wrested, or "violently perverting the sence of it. The other replyes. I "hoped rather that thou wouldest confesse; that in thy whole "life thou had'st never heard an interpretation more acute, "and true, then this, nor which did savour more of somewhat "divine, or evidenced more clearly its revelation from God. I "truly have not light conjectures, that he who brought it first "to light in our age (now this was he, who in this age renewed the opinion of the Originall of Christ, which I constantly "defend) (*that is, his Uncle Lælius*) obtained it of Christ by "many Prayers. This truly I dare affirme, that whereas God "revealed many things to that man, at that time altogether "unknown to others, yet there is scarce any thing amongst "them all, that may seeme more divine, then this interpretation.

Fateor me per omnem vitam meam non magis contortam scripturæ interpretationem audivisse; ideoq; eam penitus improbo: Eras: Joan. *Cum primum fatendi verbum in tuis verbis animadverti, speravi te potius nullam in tua vita scripturæ interpretationem audivisse, quæ hac sit aut acutior aut verior; quæ; magis divinum quid saperet, & a Deo ipso patefactam fuisse præ se ferat. Ego quidem certe non leves conjecturas habeo, illum, qui primus ætate nostra eam in lucem pertulit (hic autem is fuit, qui primus quo; sententiam de Christi origine, quam ego constanter defendo renovavit) precibus multis ab ipso Christo impetrasse. Hoc profecto affirmare ausim, cùm Deus illi viro permulta, aliis prorsus tunc temporis incognita, patefecerit, vix quidquam inter illa omnia esse quod interpretatione hac divinius videri queat.* Socin: disput. cum Eras. Johan. arg. 4. p. 67.

Of

Of this esteeme is this Interpretation of these words with them. They professe it to be one of the best, and most *divine* discoveries, that ever was made by them; whereto for my part I freely assent; though withall, I believe it to be as violent a perverting of the Scripture, & *corrupting* of the word of God, as the World can beare witnesse to. §. 40.

1. Let the Christian Reader, without the least *prejudiciall* thoughts from the Interpretation of this, or that man, consult the Text, and Context. The Head of the discourse, which gives occasion to these words of Christ, concerning himselfe, lyes evidently and undeniably in v. 51. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my saying, he shall never see death*: upon this, the Jewes rise up against him, as one that boasted of himselfe above measure, and preferred himselfe before his betters: v. 52. *Then said the Iewes unto him, now we know that thou hast a Divell; Abraham is dead, and the Prophets, and thou sayest, if a man keep my sayings he shall never taste of death.* and v. 53. *Art thou greater then our Father Abraham, who is dead, and the Prophets are dead, whom makest thou thy selfe to be.* Two things are here charged on him by the Jewes. First in *generall*, that he preferred, exalted, and honoured himselfe. 2. In *particular*, that he made himselfe better then *Abraham* their Father. To both which charges Christ answers in order in the following words: To the First, or generall charge of *honouring himselfe*, v. 54, 55. *Iesus answered, if I honour my selfe, my honour is nothing; it is my Father that honoureth me, of whom ye say, that he is your God. Ye have not known him, but I know him, and if I should say I know him not, I shall be a Lyar like unto you; but I know him, and keep his saying.* His honour he had from God, whom they professed, but knew not. 2. To that of *Abraham* he replies, v. 56. *Your Father Abraham rejoyced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.* Though *Abraham* was so truly great, & the *Friend of God*, yet his great joy was from his beliefe in me; whereby he saw my day. To this the Jewes reply, labouring to convince him of falsehood, from the impossibility of the things that he had asserted, v. 57. *Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?* *Abraham* was dead so many hundred years before thou wast borne; how couldest thou see him, or he thee? To this in the last place our Saviour replyes, v. 58. *verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.* The Jews knowing that by these words he asserted his Deity,

and

and that it was impossible on any other account to make good that he who in their esteem was not *fifty years old*, (indeed but a little above thirty) should be before *Abraham*, as in a *case of blasphemy*, they take up stones to stone him, v. 59. as was their perpetuall manner, to attempt to kill him under pretence of blasphemy, when he asserted his Deity, as *Joh.* 5. 18. *Therefore thought the Jewes the more to kill him,* ---- *because he said, that God was his Father, making himselfe equall with God.*

§. 41. This naked, and unprejudicate view of the Text, is sufficient to obviate all the operous and sophisticall exceptions of our *Catechists*; so that I shall not need long to insist upon them. That which we have asserted may be thus proposed. He who in respect of his humane nature, was *many hundred years* after *Abraham*, yet was in another respect existing *before him*; He had an existence before his birth, as to his divine nature. Now this doth Christ expressely affirme concerning himselfe. And nothing else is pretended but only his *divine nature*, wherein he should so exist. They say then,

§. 42. 1. *That these words do not signify preeternity, but only something before Abraham.* It is enough, that his Existence so many *hundred years* before his nativity is evidently asserted; his Eternity from thence will evidently be concluded, and they will not deny, that he may as well be *eternall*, as be before *Abraham*. But

2. *The words may be rendred, priusquam Abraham fiat, ego sum*; before *Abraham be made*. But 1. They *may* be so rendred, is no proof at all that they ought to be so: and, as was before observed, if this be sufficient to evade the sence of a place, that any word in it *may* otherwise be rendred, because it is, or *may* be so in some other place, nothing certain can be concluded from any Testimony of the Scriptures whatever. But that they may not be so rendred, is evident. 1. From the *Context*, as before declared. 2. From the opposition between ἐγώ εἰμι, *I am*, and *Abraham was*, which evidently denotes a time past, as it stands in comparison with what Christ saies of himselfe. And 3. The words in such a construction as this, requires an Interpretation as to the time past. And 4. because this Interpretation of the words corrupts the whole sence of the place, and wrests it contrary to the designe, and intendment of our Saviour. But then they say,

3. *The*

3. *The sence is excellent: for before Abraham be made, is as much as before he be Abraham, or the Father of many Nations, which he was when the Gospell was Preached to the conversion of the Gentiles. I am, that is, I am the light of the world, which you should do well to walke in, and attend unto.* §. 43.

1. That this Interpretation in *generall* is altogether *alien*, and strange from the scope of the place, the Christian Reader, upon the bare view of it, will be able to judge. 2. It is *false*. 1. Because *Abraham* was the Father of many Nations, *Jewes*, and *Proselites*, before the Preaching of the Gospell, as Gen. 15.5. 2. It is *false*, that *Abraham* was not *Abraham*, untill after the assension of Christ, and Preaching of the Gospell to the Gentiles. He was made *Abraham*, from his first enjoyment of his name, and seed in *Isaack*, and is constantly so called. 3. It is *frivolous*; for if Christ was, before *Abram* was made *Abraham*, we obtain what we plead for, for he was made so, when God gave him that name. But, it should be, before *Abram be made Abraham*, or there is no sence in the words: nor then neither, unlesse *Abraham* be taken as a common *Appellative* for the *Father of many Nations*, and not a Proper name, whereof in Scripture there is not any example. 4. It is *horribly* wrested, 1. In making the words, *I am*, *Elipticall*; whereas there is neither need of, nor colour for such a pretence. 2. In supplying the feigned *Eclipsis* with a word at such a distance, as from v. 12. to v. 58. 3. In making Christ to say, he is the *Light of the world*, before the Preaching of the Gospell to the Gentiles, when *the World* is every where in the Gospell taken quite in another sence, for the *Jewes*, and *Gentiles*, and not for the *Jewes* only, which according to this Interpretation it must be. 4. It leaves no reason of the following attempt of the *Jewes* to stone him, upon the particular provocation of this Assertion, he having before affirmed himselfe to be the *Light of the World*, which they were not moved at. There is indeed no end of the *falsities*, *follies*, and *corruptions* of this perverting, and corrupting of the word of God.

For the Grammaticall vindication of the words, and the Translation of the word γίνεσθαι, in a sence of that which is past, there is no occasion administred by our *Catechists*, and therefore I shall not trouble the Reader therewith,

And

And of the first sort of Testimonies, which they except against, and their exceptions, thus farre.

§. 44. A little Animadversion upon the *Catechists* good friend *Grotius*, shuts up this Discourse and Chapter. In the *End* he agrees with them, but fixes on a new *medium* for the accomplishment of it, not daring to *espouse* an interpretation so absurd in it selfe, and so abhorrent from the common sence of all men, that ever professed the name of Christ. He takes then another course, yet no lesse aiming then they, to disappoint this evidence of the *preexistence* of Christ before his Nativity: πρὶν Αβραὰμ γενέσθ. *Antequam esset*, (saith he) *before he was*: and gives many instances to prove the propriety of so translating that expression. Ἐγώ εἰμι: *præsens pro imperfecto: eram*: *Syrus*. Ἐγὼ πρὶν *Nonnus*: *sic in Græco Psal*: 90.2. πρὶν τὰ ὄρη γενηθῆναι σὺ εἶ. very good. *before Abraham was, or was borne, Christ was*, as in that of the Psalme, *before the Mountaines were made, thou art*. And a little to helpe a friend at so good a work: It is no new thing for this *Evangelist* to use the *present* for the *præterimperfect tense*: as Chap. 14. 9. τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με'. *I am* so long, for I *was*, or I *have been* so long with you: &c. And Chap: 15. 27. ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε: *because you have been with me from the beginning*: Thus farre then we are agreed: but how should this be, that Christ thus was, before *Abraham* was, *Fuerat* (saith he) *autem ante Abrahamum Iesus, divina constitutione. In Gods appointment Iesus was before Abraham was borne*: yea and so was *Grotius*, and *Socinus*, and every man in the World, for *known unto God are all his works from the foundation of the World*. And this is that great *priviledge* it seems, that our Saviour vindicates to himselfe, without any *occasion*, to no *purpose*, insisting on that, which is common to him with all the *Elect of God* in the best sence of the words. Of that other Text of Scripture *Ioh*: 17.5. which together with this he labours to corrupt, I shall speak afterwards. I shall only adde that our great Doctours do not in this businesse agree. *Grotius* here makes no mention of *Socinus* his Glosse: and *Socinus* before hand rejects this of *Grotius*, as absurd and fond; and as such let it passe; as having no *occasion* given from the words foregoing, nor *colour* from the matter, nor phrase of words, no *significancy* to the businesse in hand.

CAP:

CHAP. IX.

The Preeternity of Christ farther evinced. Sundry texts of Scripture vindicated.

§. 1. IN the consideration of the ensuing *Testimonies* I shall content my selfe with more briefe obſervations *upon*, and discoveries of the corruption of our Adversaries, having given a large Testimony thereof in the Chapter foregoing. Thus then they proceed.

§. 2.

What are the Testimonies of Scripture wherein they think, that this Preeternity of Christ is not indeed expressed, but yet may thence be proved?

Those which seeme to attribute to the Lord Iesus some things from Eternity, and some things in a certaine and determinate time.

Quæ vero sunt Testimonia Scripturæ, in quibus putant, non exprimi quidem præ-æternitatem Christi, ex iis tamen effici posse?

Ea quæ videntur Domino Iesu quædam res attribuere ab æterno; quædam verò tempore certo & definito.

Let the Gentlemen take their own way and method; we shall meet with them at the first *stile*, or rather *brazen wall*, which they endeavour to climbe over.

§. 3.

What are the Testimonies which seeme to attribute some things to the Lord Iesus from Eternity?

They are those, from which they endeavour to confirme that Christ was begotten from Eternity of the Essence of his Father.

Quænam sunt Testimonia, quæ Domino Iesu ab æterno res quasdam attribuere videntur?

Sunt ea, ex quibus conantur exstruere Christum ab æterno ex essentia patris genitum.

These are *some* of the places wherein this Property of the God-head, *Eternity*, is ascribed to our Saviour; it is confessed.

But from what places do they endeavour to prove, that Christ was from Eternity begotten of the Essence of his Father?

From these chiefely, Mic. 5. 2. Psal. 2. 7. *and* 110. 10. Prov. 8. 23.

Ex quibus vero locis exstruere conantur, Christum ab æterno ex essentia Patris genitum?

Ex his potissimum. Mich. 5. 2. Psal. 2. 7. & 110. 10. Prov. 8. 23.

These

These are only some of the Testimonies that are used to this purpose. 2. It is enough to prove Christ *Eternall*, if we prove him *begotten of his Father*, for no such thing can be *new* in God. 3. That he is the *only begotten Son of the Father*, which is of the same import, with that here opposed by our *Catechists*, §. 4. hath been before declared and proved Chap. 6.

Qui vero ad hæc Testimonia respondendum est?

Antequam ad singula Testimonia respondeam, sciendum est, eam ex essentia Patris generationem esse impossibilem. Nam si Christus ex essentia Patris genitus fuisset, aut partem essentiæ sumpsisset, aut totam. Essentia partem sumere non potuit, eo quod sit impartibilis divina essentia; neq; totam, cum sit una numero, ac proinde incommunicabilis.

But how must we answer these Testimonies?

"Before I answer to each Testimony, it is to "be known, that this Generation of the Essence "of the Father is impossible. For if Christ were "begotten of the Essence of his Father, either he "tooke his whole Essence, or but part: part of his "Essence he could not take, for the divine Essence "is impartible: nor the whole, for it being one "in number is incommunicable.

And this is the fruit of measuring *Spirituall* things by *carnall*; *infinite* by *finite*; God by our selves; the object of *Faith*, by corrupted Rules of corrupted *Reason*. But 1. that which God hath* *revealed* to be so, is not *impossible* to be so; *let God be true & all men lyers*: that this is *revealed*, hath been undeniably evinced. 2. What is *impossible* in *finite*, limited Essences, may be possible & convenient to that which is *infinite* & *unlimited*; as is that whereof we speake. 3. It is not *impossible*, in the sence wherein that word must here be used, if any thing be signified by it. *It is not, it cannot be so, in limited things*, therefore not in things infinite; we cannot comprehend it, therefore it cannot be so; *but the nature of the thing, about which it is, is inconsistent with it*; this is denyed, for God hath revealed the contrary. 4. For the *parting* of the divine Essence, or receiving *a part* of the divine essence, our *Catechists* might have left out, as having none to push at with it, none standing in the way of that *horne* of their *Dilemma*. 5. We say then, that in the Eternall Generation of the Son, the *whole* Essence of the Father is communicated to the Sonne, as to a *personall existence* in the same Essence without multiplication or division of it; the same essence continuing still *one* in number; and this without the least shew of *impossibility* in an infinite essence. All the Arguments that lye against it, being taken from

* *Nisi Scriptura dixisset, non licuisset dicere, sed ex quo scriptum est dici potest.* Rabb. Ruben. apud Galat. lib. 3.

from the Propertys and attendencys of that which is finite.

Come we to the particular testimonys: The first is Mic. 5. 2, §. 5. *But thou Bethlem-Ephratah though thou be little among the thousands of Iudah, yet out of thee shall come forth unto me, that is to be a Ruler in Israel whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting, or the dayes of Eternity.*

How must this first testimony of the Scripture be answered?

"This Testimony hath nothing at all of his "Generation of the Essence of his Father: and "a preeternall Generation it no way proves. For "here is mention of beginning and dayes, which "in Eternity have no place. And these words "which in the vulgar are from the dayes of Eter-"nity, in the Hebrew are from the dayes of *seculi* "the dayes of an age. And *Dies seculi* are the same "with *dies antiqui*, as *Isa.* 63. 9, 11. *Mal.* 3 4. The "sence of this place is, that Christ should have the "originall of his Nativity from the beginning, "and from the ancient yeares, that is, from that "time wherein God established a King among "his people; which was done really in *David*, "who was a Bethlehemite, and the author of the "stock, and Family of Christ.

Qui tamen ad primum Scripturæ Testimonium respondendum est?

Id Testimonium de generatione ex essentia Patris nihil prorsus habet; generationem vero præ-æternam nulla probat ratione, hic enim mentio fit initii & dierum, quæ in æternitate locum non habent, & verba hæc, quæ in vulgata leguntur, a diebus æternitatis, in Hæbræo extant, a diebus seculi: dies vero seculi idem quod dies antiqui notant, ut Es. 63. 9. & 11. *Mal.* 3. 4. *Sententia vero loci hujus est, Christum originem nativitatis suæ ab ipso principio & annis antiquis ducturum, id est, ab eo tempore, quo Deus in populo suo regem stabilivit, quod reipsa in Davide factum est, qui & Bethlehemita fuit, & Autor stirpis, & familiæ Christi.*

R. 1. Who necessitated our *Catechists* to urge this place to prove the Generation of Christ, when it is used only to prove his *Generation to be Eternall*: the thing it selfe being proved by other Testimonies in abundance. That he was begotten of the Father is confessed: that he was begotten of the *Essence* of his Father was before proved. Yea that which is here called * *his going forth*, is his *Generation* of his Father, or somewhat else that our Adversaries can assigne: That it is not the *latter* shall immediately be evinced. מוצאתיו

2. Here is no mention of the * *Beginning*; and those who in the latter words reject the *vulgar edition*, cannot *honestly* insist on the former from thence, because it serves their turne. Yet how that *word* is sometimes *used*, and in what sence it may מקדם

be so, where *Eternity* is intended, hath been declared in the last Chapter.

3. That *dayes* are not used with, & to expresse *Eternity* in Scripture, though strictly there be no dayes, nor *Time* in Eternity, is absurd negligence and confidence to affirme, *Iob.* 10. 5. *Are thy dayes as the dayes of man? Are thy yeares as mans dayes?* Hence God is called the *Ancient of dayes Dan.* 7. 9. *Thou art the same, and thy yeares shall not faile* Heb. 1. 12.

4. For the word *Gnolam*, translated *seculi*: it hath in the Scripture various significations. It comes from a * word signifying *to hide*; and denotes an unknown *hidden* duration. Principally *perpetuum, æternum, sempiternum*: That which is preeternall and eternall. Sometimes a very long time. *Gen.* 9. 12. & v. 16. that is perpetuall: so *Gen* 17. 13 and in other places, with a reference to the soveraignty of God. *Gen.* 21. 33. It is ascribed to God as a *property* of his, and signifies eternall: *Jehova Gnolam:* so *Psal.* 89. 2. as also *Isa.* 45. 17. Let all places where the word in Scripture, in this sence is used, be reckoned up, (which are above 300) and it will appeare, that in farre the greatest number of them, it signifies absolutely *Eternity*. In the places of *Isa.* 63. 9, 11. and *Mal.* 3. 4. *a long time* indeed is signified; but yet that which reaches to the utmost of the thing, or matter treated of. And upon the same Rule where it is put *absolutely* it signifies *Eternity*. So doth *αἰὼν* in the *New Testament*, by which the *Septuagint* often render *Gnolam*; whence *ἀπὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*, may be *from Eternity*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Tit.* 1. 2. Wherein also with a like expression to that under consideration, the *times of Eternity* are mentioned, though perhaps with a peculiar respect to something at the *beginning* of the World. This then is here expressed. He that was in the *fulnesse of time* borne at *Bethlehem*, had his *goings forth* from the Father from Eternity.

עלם *latere, abscondere, occultare.* 2 Chr. 9. 2. Levit. 4. 13. *in Niphal latuit, absconditus, occultatus fuit: in Hiphil abscondit, celavit, occultavit. inde* עלמה *Virgo, quia viro occulta.* Gen. 24. 43.

§. 6. 5. The pretended *sence* of our Adversaries is a bold corruption of the Text. For 1. it applies that to *David*, and his being *borne at Bethlehem*, which the Holy Ghost expressly applies to *Iesus Christ*, *Mat.* 2. 6. and *Joh.* 1. 46. 2. The *goings forth* of Christ in this sence, are no *more from Everlasting*, then every other mans, who is from *Adam*: when yet this is peculiarly spoken of him, by way of incomparable *Eminency*. 3. They cannot give any one instance of the like expression; that *his goings forth are from*

Eternity

Eternity, should signify, he had his *originall from an ancient stock*. 4. If only Christs *originall* of the Tribe of *Judah*, and of the house of *David* were intended, why was not that expressed in plaine termes, as it is in other places, and as the place of his birth, *viz. Bethlehem*, is in this? So that we have already met our *Catechists*, and stopt them at this *Wall*, their attempt at it being very faint and absurd: and yet this is the sum of what is pleaded by *Socinus* against *Wieck. cap. 7. p. 424. Smalcius* against *Smiglecius, Chap 26. Osterod instaut. Chap. 7.* with the rest of them. He then, who was *borne at Bethlehem* in the fullnesse of time, of the *House of David* as *concerning the flesh*, had also his *goings forth*, his *Birth*, or *Generation* of the *Father*, of old, from the *dayes of Eternity*; which is that which this Testimony confirmes. Rom. 1. 13.

Grotius on this place (according to his wont) outgoes his Companions one step at least, (as he was a bold man at conjectures) & applyes this Prophesy to *Zorobabell. Natus ex Bethlehemo Zorobabel recte dicitur, quod ex Davidis Familia esset, quæ orta Bethlehemo. Zorobabell is rightly said to be borne at Bethlehem, being of the family of David, which had its originall from Bethlehem.* §. 7.

That *Zorobabell* is here at all intended, he doth not attempt to prove, either from the *Text, context, circumstances* of the place, *designe* of the *Prophesy*, or any thing else, that might give light into the intendment of the Holy Ghost. That it belongs properly to Christ we have a better interpreter to assure us then *Grotius*, or any of his *Rabbins, Matth. 2. 5.* I know that in his *Annotations* on that place he allows the Accommodation of the words to Christ: But we cannot allow them to be spoken of any other, The Holy Ghost expresly fitting them to him. And if *Zorobabell*, who was borne at *Babylon*, may be said to be borne at *Bethlehem*, because *David*, from whom he descended, was borne there; what need all that labour and trouble, that our *Saviour* might be borne at *Bethelehem*? If it could not be said of Christ, that he was borne at *Bethelehem*, though he were of the linage of *David* unles he had actually been borne there indeed: certainely *Zorobabell*, who was borne at *Babylon*, could not be said on the account of his *Progenitour* five hundred yeares before, to be borne there. §. 8.

For the second part of this Text, or the words we insist on §. 9.

for the proofe of our intention, he useth the same shift in the same words with our Catechists; *origo ipsi ab olim, a temporibus longis: id est, originem trahit a domo illustri antiquitus, & per quingentos annos regnanti ice. His originall is from of old, from a long time: that is, he hath his originall from an ancient illustrious house, that had reigned 500. yeares.*

Of the sence of the words I have spoken before. I shall only adde, that the use of this note is to confute the other. For if his being borne at *Bethlehem* signify his being of the Family of *David*, and nothing else, he being not indeed borne there, what need this addition, if these obscure words signify no more but what was spoken before? Yea and herein the learned man forsaketh his Masters, all generally concluding, that it is the *Messiah* who is here alone intended. The Chaldee Paraphrast expresly puts in the name of *Messiah*. His words are, *out of thee shall the Messiah come forth before me.* And some of them do *Mystically* interpret *hedem* of the mind of God, from whence the *word, or wisdome* of God is brought forth. Because as *they say*, the word denotes the *first numeration of the Crown*, or of that *name of God* which signifyes his *Essence*.

§. 10. The second is Psal. 2.7. *The Lord hath said unto me, thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee.*

To this second what is to be answered?

"Neither in that is there any thing of Generation of the Essence of the Father, nor of a Pre-eternall generation. For the word [to day] "signifying a certaine time, cannot denote pre-eternity. But that God begot him, doth not "evince that he was begotten of his Essence; "which appeares from hence, that the same "words, *this day have I begotten thee*, are in the first "sence used of *David*: who was begotten neither "from Eternity, nor of the Essence of the Father. "2. Because the Apostle *Paul* brings these words "to prove the Resurrection of Christ. *Act.* 13.33. "And the Author to the *Hebrewes* cites them for "the glorifying of the Lord Jesus, *Heb.* 1.5. and "5.5. And lastly from hence, that it is manifest "that God otherwise begets then by his Essence, seeing

Ad secundum vero quid? Neq; in ea de generatione ex essentia Patris, nec de generatione præaterna prorsus quicquam haberi: etenim vox hodie, cum certum tempus designet, præ-æternitatem denotare non potest. Quod vero Deus eum genuerit, non evincit eum ex essentia ejus genitum: id quod patet ex eo, quod hæc eadem verba, ego hodie genui te, primo sensu de Davide dicantur, quem constat neq; ab æterno, nec ex essentia Dei genitum. Deinde, quod Paulus Apostolus eadem verba ad approbandam Christi resurrectionem afferat. Act. 13. 33. & Autor ad Hebræos ad glorifi-

"seeing the Scripture declares Believers to be be-
"gotten of God; as is to be seen *Joh.* 1. 13. 1 *Joh.* 3.
"9. *Iam.* 1. 18.

cationem Domini Jesu cite, Heb. 1 5. & 5. 5. *Deniq; ex ea re, quod constet Deum aliter quàm ex essentia generare, dum a Deo genitos credentes Scriptura pronunciat, ut videre est.* Ioh. 1. 13. 1 Joh. 3. 9. Jac. 1. 18.

§. 11. 1. There is mention in these words of Christs *Generation* of his Father; of being *begotten* of him before his *Incarnation*, this being spoken of him under the *Old Testament*; and to deny that there is any such thing in the Text, as that which upon this consideration we urge it to prove, is only to *begge* the thing in Question.

2. *To day*, being spoken of God, of him who is *Eternall*, to whom all time is so present, as that nothing is properly *yesterday, nor to day*, does not denote necessarily such a proportion of time, as is intimated. But is expressive of an Act *eternally* present, nor *past*, nor *future*.

3. It cannot be proved that the words are spoken at all of *David*, so much as *Typically*: nor any thing else in that *Psalme* from *v.* 7. to the end. Yea the contrary is evident from every verse following; especially the 12. where *Kings and Rulers* are called to *worship him*, of whom he speakes, and threatned with *destruction* if they do not; and *they* are pronounced *blessed* who *put their trust* in him: which cannot be spoken of *David*; God declaring them to be cursed who put their trust in man: *Jer.* 17. 5, 6, 7.

4. It is granted that the Apostle makes use of these words, when he mentions the *Resurrection* and *Exaltation* of Christ: not that Christ was then begotten, but that he was then *declared* to be the only begotten Sonne of God: his Resurrection and Exaltation being *manifestations* of his Sonship, not causes of his *Filiation*, as hath been at large declared. So the *Sun* is said to *arise* when it doth first to us appeare.

5. True, *God hath other Sons, and Believers are said to be begotten of God*, but how? by *Regeneration*, & turning from sin; as in the places quoted is evident. That Christ is so *begotten* of God, is blasphemous once to imagine. Besides, he is the *only begotten* Sonne of the Father, so that no other is begotten with a generation of the *same kind* with him. It is evident then by this *Testimony*, and from these words, that Christ is so the Son of God

as

as no *Angels* are his Sonnes in the same kind: for that the Apostle produceth these words to prove, *Heb.* 1.5. *For unto which of the Angells said he at any time, thou art my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee*; and againe, *I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Sonne.* Now the Angells are the Sonnes of God by *Creation*, *Job.* 1.6. and 38.7. He is also *such a Son*, and *so* begotten, as *Believers* are not. For they are *begotten* by *Regeneration* from sin, and *Adoption* into the *Family* of God: Therefore Christ who is the *Sonne of God* in another kind, then Angells and Men, who are so by Creation, Regeneration, and Adoption, is the *naturall Sonne* of God by *Eternall Generation*; which is also proved from this place.

§. 12. In this whole Psalme *Grotius* takes no notice of Jesus Christ: indeed in the entrance he tels us, that a *mysticall* and abstruse sence of it may belong to Christ, & so the *Rabbins* acknowledge, & so the Apostle took it. But throughout the whole doth he not make the least application of it to Christ, but meerely to *David*, although so many passages of it are urged in the new Testament to have their Accomplishment in Christ, and the things which concerned him. These words, thou art *my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee*, he sayes may be thus rendred *O fili mi, hodie (id est hoc tempore) ego te genui*; *novam vitam, scilicet regalem tibi contuli*: but that the words may not *aptly* be so translated, that they are not so rendred by the Apostle (*Heb.* 1.5.) He knew well enough. בני אתה אני, is *filius meus tu*, not *fili mi*: nor doth the rendring of it by the *vocative*, any way answer the words going before. *I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my Son*: that is the thing I will declare. 2. That *hodie* should be *hoc tempore*, relating to any certain time of *Davids* raigne, cannot be reconciled to the Apostles Application of that expression on sundry occasions, as hath been manifest. 3. I have given thee a *new, or a Regall life*, is somewhat an uncouth exposition of *genui te*; without warrant, without Reason, or Argument; and it is inconsistent with the time of the Psalmes writing, according to *Grotius* himselfe: He referrs it to 2 *Sam.* 8. when *David* had been *King* over Israel many years.

Sensus primus & apertus ad Davidem pertinet; mysticus & abstrusior ad Messiam: quo modo cumpsere Apost. Annot. in v. 1.

§. 13. To serve his *Hypothesis*, the two last verses are miserably wrested. The command of *worshipping Christ*, v. 12. is a command of doing *homage* to *David*. And the last verse is thus glossed,

beati

beati omnes qui confidunt in eo, i.e. qui fidei ejus regis (id est, meæ) se permittunt. They are blessed (sayes David) who commit themselves to my faith and care: doubtlesse the thought of any such thing was as remote from the *heart* of the holy man, as this *Glosse* is from the *sence* of the place. That they are *blessed* who trust in the Lord', that is, *commit themselves to his care*, he every where declareth; yea this he makes alwayes the property of a blessed man: but that they are so who *trust in him*, not the least word to that purpose did the holy person ever utter: he knew they were cursed of God, who put their trust in man. The word here is חיסי from חסה *to repaire to any one for protection*; and it is used to expresse our trusting in God. *Psal.* 18. 30. as also *Psal.* 31. 19. on which men are frequently pronounced blessed; but that it should be apply'd to *David*, and a *blessing* annexed thereunto, we were to learne.

The third Testimony of *Psal.* 110. 10. we passe over with our Adversaries, as not to the purpose in hand; being a mistake of the *vulgar Latine*. §. 14.

The 4th is *Prov.* 8. 23. *I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.*

What dost thou answer to this Testimony?

"That thou maist understand the matter the "better, know, that from this place they thus "dispute; The Wisdome of God is begotten "from Eternity; Christ is the Wisdome of God; "therefore he is begotten from Eternity, 1 *Cor.* "1. 24. That this Argument is not firme appears "from hence, that *Solomon* treats of Wisdome "simply, and absolutely considered, without "the addition of the Word, God; *Paul*, not simply and absolutely, but with the addition of "the word, God. 2. *Solomon* treats of Wisdome, "which neither is a Person, nor can be, as appears from the diverse effects ascribed to this "Wisdome, Chap. 7, 8, 9. amongst which are "these words; By me Kings rule, and Princes "decree Righteousnesse; and in the beginning "of the Chapter, he brings in Wisdome sending "her maidens, and inviting all to her: But *Paul*

Ad quartum vero quid?

Ut rem melius accipias, scito eos ex hoc loco ad eum modum argumentari: Sapientia Dei ab æterno est genita: Christus est Dei sapientia: ergo ab æterno est genitus. 1 *Cor.* 1. 24. *Id argumentum firmum non esse hinc patet; primum, quod Solomon agat de sapientia simpliciter, & absolutè considerata, sine additione vocis Dei: Paulus vero non simpliciter & absolutè; sed cum additione, nempe, Dei. Deinde, Solomon agit de sapientia, quæ neq; est persona, nec esse potest, ut e variis effectis, quæ huic sapientiæ attribuit, apparet, & hoc* 7, 8, 9. *cap. ex quibus sunt ea, per me Reges regnant, & Principes justa decernunt: & initio cap.* 9.

introducit sapientiam omnes ad se invitantem, & mittentem virgines suas. Paulus vero agit de sapientia, quæ persona est. Tertio, verba hæc, quæ sunt reddita ab æterno, in Hæbræo extant a seculo: aliud vero esse ab æterno, aliud a seculo, indicant loci Isa. 64. 4. Jer. 2. 20. Luk. 1. 70. *& alii permulti similes.*

" treateth of that Wisdome which is a Person,
" 3. The words which are rendred from ever-
" lasting, in the Hebrew are *à seculo*; but that
" from everlasting, and *à seculo*, are diverse, *Isa.*
" 64. 4. *Jer.* 2. 20. *Luk.* 1. 70. with many like
" places do declare.

§. 15. 1. Our Argument hence is: Christ the second Person of the *Trinity* is spoken of, *Prov.* 8. 22. under the name of *Wisdome*. Now it is said expresly there of *Wisdome*, that it was *begotten from everlasting*, and therefore the *Eternall Generation* of Christ is hence confirmed. Our Reasons are, 1. Because the things here spoken of can be applied to *no other*. 2. Because the very same things are affirmed of Christ, *Joh.* 1. 1. 3. Because Christ is the *Wisdome of God*, and so called in the Scripture; not only in the expression of ὁ λόγος, but ῥητῶς 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. 2. That by *Wisdome*, *Solomon* intended the *Wisdome of God*, and that that word may be supplied, is most evident from what is spoken of it: Let the place be read. 3. Christ is called not only *the Wisdome of God*, but also *Wisdome*, *absolutely* and simply; and that not only *Prov.* 1. 20. but *Math.* 11. 19. 4. The *Wisdome* that *Solomon* treats of, is evidently a *Person*, and such things are ascribed thereunto, as can be proper to none but a *Person*: such are those v: 30, 31. *I was by him, one brought up with him, I was daily his delight, rejoycing alwaies before him, rejoycing in the habitable part of the Earth, &c.* That it is the same *Wisdome* spoken of Chap: 7. and here, is not evident. Yet is there not any thing in that, attributed to it, but what suits well unto a *Person*. Much lesse in the beginning of the 9 Chapter, the *Invitation* there being such as may be made by a *Person* only: It is a *Person* who sends out *Messengers* to invite to a banquet, as Christ doth in the Gospell. *Kings rule, and Princes decree judgement* by the Authority of a Person; and without him they can do nothing.

§. 16. 3. The word translated, *from everlasting*, is the same with that considered before *Mich*: 5. 2. 2. The words following do so evidently confirme the meaning of the word to *be as* expressed, that it is marvelous the *Gentlemen* durst venture upon the exception in this place. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before*

before his workes of old: that is, before the Creation, as is at large expounded, v. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29.

And this is *all*, the whole summe of what any of our *Adversaries*, or rather the *Adversaries of Jesus Christ*, have to object in their cause against these Testimonies: whence we thus argue.

He who was *begotten* of God the Father with an Eternall Generation, is Eternall; and so consequently God: but so is Jesus Christ begotten of God the Father, with an Eternall Generation; Therefore he is Eternall, and God blessed for ever.

To cleare what hath been spoken, I shall close my considerations of this Text of Scripture with a briefe *paralell*, between what is spoken in this place of *Wisdome*, and what is asserted of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. §. 17.

1. It is *Wisdome* that is spoken of; so is Christ, *Math.* 11.19. 1 *Cor.* 1.24. *Col.* 2.3. 2. *Wisdome* was set up *from everlasting* v. 23. Grace is given in Christ, πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, *from everlasting*, 2 *Tim.* 1.9. He is the *beginning*, *Col.* 1.5. the *first and last*. *Rev.* 1. 17. 3. *The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way*, saies Wisdome v. 23. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God*, *Ioh.* 1.1,2. 4. *Before the Mountaines were setled, before the hills were brought forth*, v. 25. He is the *First borne of every Creature*, *Col.* 1.15. *He is before all*, v. 17. 5. *I was daily his delight, rejoycing alwaies before him*, v. 30. *This is my beloved Sonne, in whom I am well pleased*, *Matth.* 3.17. *The only begotten Sonne is in the bosome of the Father*, *Ioh.* 1.18. 6. *By me Kings reigne, and Princes &c.* v. 15, 16. *He is the Prince of the Kings of the Earth*, *Rev.* 1.5. *The King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*, *Revel.* 19.16. 7. *Rejoycing in the habitable part of the Earth, and my delights were with the Sonnes of Men*, v. 31. *For the Word was made Flesh, and dwelt amongst us, and we saw his glory, as the glory of the only begotten Sonne of God.* 8. Compare also v. 34. with *Ioh.* 13.17. *Luk.* 11.28. *Ioh.* 10.9. And v. 35, and 36. with *Ioh.* 6.44,47. and many the like instances might be given. §. 18.

Grotius takes no notice of Christ in this place, yea he seemes evidently to exclude him from being here intended; his first note on v. 1. is, *Hæc de ea sapientia, quæ in lege apparet, exponunt Hæbræi; & sane ei, si non soli, at præcipuè hæc attributa conveniunt. The Hebrews expound these things of that Wisdome which appears in the Law; and truly these Attributes agree thereunto, if not only, yet chiefly.* Of this §. 19.

assertion he gives no reason. The contrary is evident from what is above said, and proved. The *Authority* of the *Moderne Rabbins* in the exposition of those places of Scripture, which concerne the *Messiah*, is of no value. They do not only as their forefathers, erre, not knowing the Scriptures; but malitiously corrupt them, out of hatred to Jesus Christ. In the meane time one no lesse versed in the *Hebrew Authors*, than our *Annotatour*, expounding this place, from them concludes, *nec dubito, hinc Iohannem augustum illud & magnificum Evangelii sui initium sumpsisse. In principio erat verbum: nam verbum & sapientia idem sunt, & secundam Trinitatis personam indicant.* *I doubt not, but that Iohn took that reverend and lofty entrance of his Gospell, In the beginning was the word, from hence: For the Word, and Wisdome are the same; and denote the second Person of the Trinity.*

Mercer in Loc. v. 22.

§. 20. Before I proceed to those that follow, I shall adde some of them which are produced, and insisted on usually for the same end and purpose with those mentioned before, and which in other places are excepted against by the *Catechists*, with whom we have to do; but properly belong to this head.

§. 21. Of those is *Joh.* 17. 5. *And now O Father glorify me with thine own selfe, with the glory which I had with thee, before the World was.* To this they put in their exceptions towards the end of the Chapter under consideration; saying.

Quid ad hoc respondes?

Neq; hinc naturam divinam probari. Posse enim aliquem gloriam habere antequam mundus fieret apud Patrem, nec tamen hinc effici eum esse Deum, apparet 2 Tim. 1. 9. *ubi ait Apostolus de credentibus, illis datam fuisse gratiam, ante tempora secularia. Praeterea, hic scriptum est, Jesum rogare hanc gloriam, quod naturae Divinae prorsus repugnat. Loci vero sententia est: Christum rogare Deum, ut ei gloriam reipsa det, quam habuerit apud Deum in ipsius decreto antequam mundus fieret.*

What answerest thou to this?

"Neither is here a Divine nature proved. For "that one may have glory with the Father, be- "fore the World was made, and yet not be "God, appeareth from that of 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. where "the Apostle sayes of Believers, that grace was "given unto them before the World began. Be- "sides it is here written, that Jesus asked this "Glory, which is repugnant to the Divine Na- "ture. But the sence of the place is, that Christ "asked God, that he would really give him "that Glory, which he had with God in his de- "cree before the World was.

A Divine *Glory* proves a Divine *Nature*. This Christ had from Eternity, for he had it *before the world began*; therefore He had a divine nature also. It is the manifestation of his Glory, which he had *eclipsed*, and layd aside for a season, that here he desires of God. *Phil.* 2.9,10,11,12. He *Glorifyed* his Father, by manifesting the *Glory* of his Deity, his *Name*, to others; and *He* prayes the Father to *Glorify* him, as he had *glorifyed him* on the earth. 2. There is not the same Reason of what is here asserted of Christ, and what is said of the *Elect*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. Christ here positively sayes, he *HAD Glory with his Father before the world was*; nor is this any where, in any one tittle in the Scripture expounded, to be any otherwise, but in a reall *HAVING* of that Glory. The grace that is *given* to Believers, is not said to be, before the world was, but πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, which may denote the first promise, *Gen.* 3. 15. as it doth *Tit.* 1. 2. and if it be intended of the purpose of God, which was from Eternity (as the words will beare) it is so expounded in 20. places. 3. Though the *Divine Nature pray not*, yet he who was in the *forme* of God, and *humbled* himselfe to take upon him the forme, and Employment of a *Servant*, might, and did pray: the *Godhead* prayed not, but he who was God prayed. 4. For the sence assigned, let them once shew us in the whole Book of God, where this Expression *I had* (εἶχον) may be possibly interpreted, *I had it in purpose*, or I was predestinated to it; and not *I had it really*, and *indeed*, and they say something to the purpose. In the meane time they doe but *corrupt the word of God*, (as many do) by this pretended interpretation of it. 5. If Predestination only be intended, here is nothing singular spoken of Christ, but what is common to him with all Believers; when evidently Christ speakes of something that belonged to him eminently. 6. The very expresse tenour of the words will not admit of this Glosse, (let what violence can be used:) νῦν δόξασόν με σὺ πάτερ παρὰ σαυτῷ, τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι, παρὰ σοί: The Glory that *I had with thee*, let me have it *manifested* with thee, now my work is done.

§.22. εἶχον.

Grotius falls in with our *Catechists*: τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον, *destinatione tua*; *ut* 1 Pet. 1.20. Rev. 13.8. *sicut* Ephes. 1. 3,4. *& infra* v. 24. *Simile legendi genus: sic legem fuisse arte mundum dicunt Hebræi.* §.23.

Againe, περὶ τί; refer ad illud ἔργον, & intellige ut diximus in decreto tuo.

But what intends the *Learned man* by those places of 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. *Revel.* 13.8? Is it to expound the thing that he supposes to be expressed? Or to intimate, that the phrase here used is expounded by the use of it in those other places. If the first, he *beggs* that to be the sence of *this* place, which is the sence of *them*, though neither the scope of the places, nor the sence of the Words themselves, will beare it. If the latter, it is most *false*; there is not one *word*, *Phrase*, nor *expression*, in any of the places pointed unto, at all *coincident* with them here used. Besides, the two places mentioned are of very different sences; the one speaking of Gods *purpose*, appointing Christ to be a Mediator; the other of the *Promise* give̅ presently after the fall. 2. We grant, that Christ in respect of his humane nature was *predestinated* unto Glory; but that he calls Gods purpose, *his Glory*, the *glory which he had*, which he *had with* God, wherewith he desires to be Glorifyed with him againe, is to be proved from the Text, or Context, or phrase of speech, or paralell place, or *Analogie* of Faith or somewhat, and not nakedly to be imposed on us. Let *Prov.* 8. 22, 30. *Phil.* 2. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. be consulted, as paralell to this place. *Eph.* 1. 3, 4 speaks indeed of *our predestination in* Christ, *that we should be holy*, and so come to Glory: but of the Glory, that Christ *had before the world was*, it speakes not. Yea *v.* 3. we are said to be *actually* blessed, or to *have* the Heavenly blessings, when we do enjoy them, which we are *elected* to, *v.* 4. What the *Jewes* say of the *Law*, and the like, we must allow *learned men* to tell us, that they may be *known to be so*, although the sence of the Scripture be insensibly darkned thereby.

§. 24. To the same purpose is that of *Peter* 1 *Ep.* 1. *v.* 10, 11. *Of which salvation the Prophets have enquired, and searched diligently, who Prophesied of the Grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testifyed before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.* To which adde that more cleare place, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18, 19, 20. *quickned by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the Spirits that were in prison, which sometime were disobedient ----- in the dayes of Noah.* He who was in the dayes of the *Prophets of old*, and in the dayes of *Noah*, so long before his being borne according to the

the flesh, he was from everlasting; or had an Existence antecedent to his incarnation: but this is expressly affirmed of our Saviour; It was his *Spirit* that spake in the Prophets; which if *he* were not, it could not be; for of him who is *not*, nothing can be affirmed. He preached by his *Spirit* in the dayes of *Noah*, to the *Spirits that are in prison*.

§. 25. Of this *latter* place our *Catechists* take no notice; about the *first* they enquire. *What answerest thou to this?*

"Neither is a Divine nature proved from hence. "For the Spirit which was in the *Prophets*, may "be said to be the Spirit of Christ, not that he was "given of Christ, but because he foredeclared the "things of Christ, as *Peter* there speakes; he testi-"fyed before hand of the sufferings of Christ, and "the Glory that should follow. Which manner of "speaking we have 1 *Joh* 4. 6. Hence know we "the spirit of truth, and the spirit of errour. Where "it is not called the Spirit of Truth & Errour, be-"cause truth & errour as persons do bestow the *spi-"rit* but because the *spirit* of *truth* speakes the things "of *truth*, & the Spirit of *errour* the things of *errour*.

Quid ad hoc respondes? Neque hinc naturam in Christo divinam effici. Nam hic Spiritus, qui in Prophetis erat, Christi dici potest, non quod a Christo datus fuerit, sed quod ea quæ Christi fuerunt, prænunciarit, ut ibidem Petrus ait, prænuncians illas in Christum passiones, & post hæc glorias. Quem loquendi modum etiam, 1 Joan. 4. 6. habes. Hinc cognoscimus Spiritum veritatis, & Spiritum erroris, ubi non propterea Spiritus veritatis & erroris Spiritus dicitur, quod veritas & error, tanquam personæ, eum Spiritum conferant; verum eo quod Spiritus veritatis loquatur quæ veritatis sunt, & Spiritus erroris quæ sunt erroris.

§. 26. 1. It is confessed, that if the *Spirit* that was in the *Prophets*, was the Spirit of Christ, then he hath a *Divine nature*: for the only evasion used, is, that it is not, or may not (possibly) be so meant in this place, not denying, but that if it be so, then the conclusion intended followes. 2. That this place is to be interpreted by 1 *Joh.* 4. 6. there is no colour, nor pretence. Christ is a Person; He was so, when *Peter* wrote. *Truth* and *Errour* are not; and the *Spirit* of them is to be interpreted according to the *subject matter*. 3. The Spirit in other places is called the *Spirit of Christ*, in the same sence as he is called the *Spirit of God Ro* 8. 9. *Gal.* 4. 6. 4. The *Spirit of Christ*, is said directly, *to take of him, & shew it to his Apostles*, *Joh.* 16. 15. & so he did to the Prophets. They may as well on the pretence of 1 *Joh.* 4. 6. deny him to be the *Spirit of God the Father*, as the Spirit of Christ, as being of him, and *sent* by him.

2. And thus farre of the Testimonies proving the *preexistence* of Christ unto his incarnation, and so consequently his *Eternity*; whence

whence it followes, that he is God *over all* blessed for ever, having this evidence of his eternall power and God-head. Sundry others of the same tendency will fall under consideration in our progresse.

CHAP. X.

Of the names of God given unto Christ.

§. 1. IN the next place, as a third *Head*, our *Catechists* consider the Scripturall *Attributions* of the *Names of God*, unto our Saviour Jesus Christ. Whence this is our Argument.

He who is *Jehovah, God, the only true God*, He is God properly by nature. But Jesus Christ is *Jehovah*, the *true God*, &c. Therefore he is God properly by nature.

The proposition is cleare in it selfe; of the innumerable Testimonies which are, or may be produced to confirme the Assumption, our *Catechists* fix upon a very few, namely, those which are answered by *Socinus* against *Weicke* the *Jesuite*, whence most of their exceptions to these Witnesses are transcribed. To

§. 2. the consideration of these they thus proceed.

Quænam ea loca Scripturæ quæ videntur Christo quædam tempore certo & definito attribuere?

Ea sunt duplicia; quorum alia nomina, alia facta respiciunt, quæ Christo a Scriptura attribui opinantur.

Quænam sunt quæ Christi nomina respiciunt?

Ea, ubi arbitrantur Jesum a Scriptura vocari Jehovam: Dominum exercituum, Deum verum, solum verum, Deum magnum, dominum Deum omnipotentem, qui fuit, qui est, & qui venturus est; Deum qui acquisivit proprio sanguine Ecclesiam; Deum qui animam posuit pro nobis. Jerem. 23. 6. Zac. 2. 8. 1 Joan. 5. 20. Jud. 4. Tit. 2. 13. Apoc. 1. 8. 4. 8. Act. 20. 28. 1 Joan. 3. 16.

What are those places of Scripture, which seeme to attribute something to Christ in a certaine and definite time?

"They are of two sorts, whereof some respect "the Names, other the Workes which they sup. "pose in the Scriptures to be Attributed to Christ.

Which are they that respect the names of Christ?

"Those, where they suppose in the Scripture "that Christ is called Jehovah, &c. *Jerem.* 23. 6. *Zach.* 2. 8. 1 *John* 5. 20. *Jude* 4. *Titus* 2. 13. *Revel.* 1. 18. *and* 4. 8. *Acts* 20. 28. 1 *John* 3. 16.

The

The first Testimony is *Jerem:* 23. 6. in these words: *In his dayes Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is his name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our Righteousnesse.* To which adde the next, *Zech.* 2. 8.

Before I come to consider their *Exceptions* to these Texts in particular, some things in Generall may be premised, for the better understanding of what we are about; and what from these places we intend to prove and confirme.

1. The end of citing these two places, is to prove, that Jesus Christ is in the Old Testament called *Iehovah*; which is by them denyed; the granting of it being *destructive* to their whole cause. §. 4.

2. It is granted, that *Iehovah* is the proper and peculiar name of the *one* only true God of Israel: a name as farre significant of his Nature and Being, as possibly we are enabled to understand: yea so farre expressive of *God*, that as the thing signified by it, is *incomprehensible*, so many have thought the very word it selfe to be *ineffable*, or (at least) not *lawfull* to be uttered. This name God peculiarly appropriates to himselfe, in an eminent manner, *Exod:* 6. 2, 9. So that this is taken for granted on all hands, that he whose name is *Iehovah*, is the *only true God*, the God of *Israel*; when ever that name is used properly, without a *Trope* or figure, it is used of him only. What the Adversaries of Christ except against this, shall be vindicated in its proper place.

3. Our *Catechists* have very *faintly* brought forth the Testimonies, that are usually insisted on in this cause; naming but two of them; wherefore I shall take liberty to adde a few more to them, out of the many that are ready at hand. *Isa.* 40. 3. *The voyce of him that cryeth in the Wildernesse, prepare ye the way of Iehovah, make straight in the desert an high way for our God.* That it is Christ who is here called *Iehovah*, is cleare from that farther expression in *Mal.* 3. 1. and the execution of the thing it selfe, *Joh.* 1. 23. *Matth.* 3. 3. *Mark.* 1. 2, 3. *Isa.* 45. 22, 23, 24, 25. *Look unto me, and be ye saved all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and there is none else, I have sworne by my selfe, the word is gone out of my mouth in Righteousnesse, and shall not returne, that unto mee every knee shall bow, every tongue shall sweare: surely, shall one say, in the Lord Iehovah have I Righteousnesse and strength; even to him shall men come, and all that are* §. 5.

incensed against him, shall be ashamed; in Jehovah shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and Glory. The Apostle expressly affirmes all this to be spoken of Christ, *Rom.* 14. 11, 12, &c. *Hos.* 13. 14. is also applied to Christ, 1 *Cor.* 15. 54, 55. He that would at once consider all the Texts of the Old Testament, chiefly ascribing this name to Christ, let him read *Zanchius de tribus Elohim*, who hath made a large collection of them.

§. 6. Let us now see what our Catechists except against the first Testimony.

What dost thou Answer to the first Testimony?

"First, that hence it cannot be necessarily evinced, that the name of Jehovah is attributed to Christ. For these words, And this is his name whereby they shall call him, the Lord our Righteousnesse, may be referred to Israel, of whom he spake a little before; In his daies shall Judah be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, &c. as from a like place may be seen in the same Prophet, Chap. 33. 15, 16. where he saith, In those daies, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of Righteousnesse to grow up unto David, and he shall execute judgement and Righteousnesse in the Land: In those daies shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, the Lord our Righteousnesse; for in the Hebrew it is expressly read, they shall call her; which last words are referred of necessity to Jerusalem; and in this place answereth to Israel, which is put in the first place: It seemes therefore likely, that also in the first place, these words, They shall call him, are referred to Israel. But although we should grant, that the name of Jehovah may be referred unto Christ, yet from the other Testimonies it appears, that it cannot be asserted, that Christ is called Jehovah simply: neither doth it thence follow, that Christ is really Jehovah. Whether therefore these last words

Quid vero tu ad ea ordine respondes, ac ante omnia ad primum?

Primum, quod ex eo confici non possit necessario nomen Jehovæ Christo attribui. Ex enim verba, & hoc est nomen ejus, quo vocabunt eum, Jehovah justitia nostra, referri possunt ad Israelem, de quo paulo superius eodem versu loquitur: In diebus ejus servabitur Juda, & Israel habitabit securè, & hoc est nomen ejus, &c. Ut è loco simili conspici potest apud eundem Prophetam cap. 33. v. 15, 16. ubi ait, in diebus illis, & in illo tempore, faciam ut existat Davidi surculus justitiæ, & faciet judicium & justitiā in terra. In diebus illis servabitur Juda & Jerusalē habitabit securè, & hoc (supple nomen) quo vocabunt eam, Jehovah justitia nostra. Etenim in Hæbræo expresse legitur, vocabunt eam, quam vocem posteriorem ad Hierusalem referri prorsus est necesse; & hoc quidem loco Israeli, qui in priori loco positus est, respondet. Videtur igitur prorsus veri simile, quod in priori etiam loco, hæc verba, vocabunt eum, ad Israelem referantur. At licet concedamus, nomen Jehovæ ad Christum posse

"words in this Testimony of Jeremiah be understood of Christ, or of Israel, their sence is, "thou Jehovah our one God wilt justify us; for "at that time when Christ was to appeare, "God would doe that in Israel.

referri, ex altero tamen Testimonio apparet asseri non posse, Iehovam simpliciter Christum vocari: neq; ex eo sequi, Christum reipsâ esse Iehovam; sive igitur de Christo, sive de Israele postrema verba in Testimonio Hieremiæ accipiantur, sententia ipsorum est, tum Iehovam unum Deum nostrum nos justificaturum. Etenim illo tempore, cum Christus appariturus esset, Deus id in Israele facturus erat.

The summe of this Answer is; 1. It *may be* these words are not spoken of Christ, but of *Israel*. 2. The same words are used of that which *is not God*. 3. If they be referred to *Christ*, they prove him not to be God. 4. Their sence is, that *God will justify us in the daies of Christ*. Of each briefly.

1. The *Subject* spoken of all along is *Christ*; He is the *subject matter* of what ever here is affirmed. I will raise up a *Righteous branch to David, He shall be a King*, and he shall *raigne*, and his name shall be called *the Lord our Righteousnesse*. 2. Why are these words to be referred to *Israel* only, and not also to *Judah*, (if to any but Christ) they being both named together, and upon the same account, (yea and *Judah* hath the preheminence, being named in the first place) and if they belong to both, the words should be, *this is their name, whereby they shall be called*. 3. *Israel* was never called *our Righteousnesse*, but Christ is called so upon the matter in the New Testament sundry times, and *is* so; 1 *Cor.* 1.30 so that without departing from the propriety of the Words, intendment, and scope of the place, with the truth of the thing it selfe, these words cannot be so perverted. The violence used to them is notoriously manifest. §. 7.

2 The expression is not the *same* in both places. Neither is *Jerusalem* there called the *Lord our Righteousnesse*; but He who calls her, is, the *Lord our Righteousnesse*; and so are the words rendred by *Arias Montanus*, and others. And if what *Jerusalem* shall be called be intimated, and not what *His Name* is that calls her, it is meerly by a *Metonymy*, upon the account of the presence of Christ in her; As the Church is called *Christ* improperly, 1 *Cor.* 12.12. *Christ properly* is Jesus only. But the words are not to be rendred, *this is the name whereby she shall be called*, but this is the *name whereby he shall call her*, the Lord our Righteousnesse; that is, *he who is the Lord our Righteousnesse* shall *call* her to §. 8.

peace and safety, which are there treated on. Christ is our *Righteousnesse*, *Jerusalem* is not.

§. 9. 3. It is evident that Christ is absolutely called *Jehovah* in *this*, as well as in the other places before mentioned, and many more. And it thence evidently followes, that he is *Jehovah*, as he who properly is called so, and understood by that name. Where God *simply* saies, his name is *Jehovah*, we believe him: and where he saies, the name of the *Branch of the house of David* is *Iehovah*, we believe him also. And we say hence, that *Christ* is *Iehovah*, or the words have not a tolerable sence: of this againe afterwards.

§. 10. 4. The interpretation given of the words is most *perverse*, and opposite to the meaning of them. The Prophet saies not, that *Iehovah the one God shall be our Righteousnesse*, but the *Branch of David* shall be *the Lord our Righteousnesse*. The subject is the *Branch of David*, not *Jehovah*. The *Branch of David* shall be called *the Lord our Righteousnesse*; that is, the *Lord shall justify* us, when the *Branch of David* shall be brought forth: Who could have discovered this sence, but our *Catechists* and their *Masters*, whose words these are. It remaineth then, that the *Branch of David*, *who Ruleth in Righteousnesse*, is *Jehovah* our Righteousnesse: our *Righteousnesse*, as being *made* so to us; *Jehovah*, as *being* so in himselfe.

§. 11. *Socin. de servit p. 3. cap. 4.* *Franz. de Sacrif. p. 786.* *Grotius* expounds *this place*, as that of *Micha* 5. 2. of *Zorubbabel*, helping on his friends with a new diversion, which they knew not of. *Socinus* as he professes being not acquainted with the *Iewish* Doctors, though some believe him not. And yet the *learned Annotatour* cannot hold out, as he begins, but is forced to put out the name of *Zorubbabell*, and to put in that of the People, when he comes to the name insisted on: so leaving no certain designe in the whole words, from the beginning to the ending.

§. 12. Two things doth he here oppose himselfe in, to the *received* Interpretation of Christians. 1. That it is *Zorubbabell* who is here intended. 2. That it is the *People* who is called the Lord *our Righteousnesse*.

For the first, thus he on v. 5. *Germen justum*, a *Righteous Branch*: *Zorubbabelem qui* צמח *ut hic appellatur, ita & Zechariæ* 6. 12. *nimirum quod velut surculus renatus esset ex Arbore Davidis quasi præcisa.*

Justitiæ

Iustitiæ nomine commendatur Zorubbabel etiam apud Zechariam, 9.9. Zorubbabel who is here called the Branch, as also Zech. 6.12. because as a Branch he arose from the Tree of David *which was as cut off. Also Zorubbabel is commended for justice or Righteousnesse, Zech. 9.9.*

That this is a Prophesy of Christ, the circumstances of the place evince: The *Rabbins* were also of the same mind, as plentifull collections from them are made to demonstrate it, by *Ioseph de Voysin, pug. fid. par. 3. dist. 1. cap. 4.* And the matter spoken of, can be accommodated to no other, as hath been declared. *Grotius* his proofes that *Zorubbabell* is intended, are worse then the opinion it selfe. That he is called the *Branch*, *Zech. 6. 12.* is most false: He who is called the Branch there, is a *King* and a *Priest*. *He shall rule upon his Throne, and he shall be a Priest*, which *Zorubbabell* was not; nor had any thing to doe with the Priestly office, which in his daies was administred by *Iehoshua*, more evidently false is it, that he is spoken of *Zech. 9. 9.* which place is precisely interpreted of Christ, and the accomplishment, in the very letter of the thing foretold, recorded, *Math. 21. 5.* The words are, *Rejoyce greatly O Daughter of Sion, shout O Daughter of Ierusalem, behold thy King cometh to thee, he is just, and having Salvation, lowly, and riding upon an Asse, and upon a Colt the foale of an Asse.* That a man professing Christian Religion, should affirme any one but Iesus Christ to be here intended, is somewhat strange. §. 13.

Upon the Accommodation of the next words to *Zorubbabell*, *A King shall raigne and prosper*, &c. I shall not insist; they contain not the matter of our present contest, though they are pittifully wrested by the Annotatour, and do no wayes serve his designe.

For the particular words about which our contest is, this is his Comment. And this is the name whereby they shall call him: *nempe populum: namely the people: they shall call the people.* How this change comes, *in his daies Iudah shall be saved, and this is the name whereby he shall be called*, that is, *the People* shall be called, he shewes not. That there is no colour of Reason for it, hath been shewed; what hath been said need not to be repeated. He proceeds. *Dominus justitia nostra*, i. e. *Deus nobis benefecit*, God hath done well for us, or dealt kindly with us. But it is not about the intimation of goodnes that is in the Words; but of the §. 14.

signification of the name given to Iesus Christ, that here we plead. In what sence Christ is the *Lord our Righteousnesse* appears, *Isa.*45.22, 23,24,25. 1 *Cor.*1.30.

§. 15. The second Testimony is Zech.2.8. in these words: *For thus saith the* Lord *of Hosts, after the Glory, hath he sent me unto the Nations which spoyled you: for he that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye; for behold, I will shake mine hand upon them, &c.* v. 9,10,11,12.

Briefely to declare what this witnesse speakes to, before we permit him to the examination of our Adversaries: The Person speaking, is, the *Lord of Hosts*: *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts*: And He is the person spoken of; *after the Glory* (saith he) (or after this glorious deliverance of you my people from the captivity wherein you were among the Nations) *hath he sent me*, even me the Lord of Hosts hath he sent. *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, he hath sent me*; and it was to the Nations, as in the words following; and who sent him? *ye shall know, that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me*; The people of *Israel* shall know, that the *Lord of Hosts* hath sent me the *Lord of Hosts* to the *Nations*: but how shall they know that he is so sent? He tells them *v.* 11. it shall be known by the conversion of the Nations: *Many Nations shall be joyned to the Lord in that day*; and what then? *They shall be my people*; mine *who am sent*; my people, the people of the Lord of Hosts that was sent; that is, of Jesus Christ, and I (saith he) whose people they are, *will dwell in the middest of them*, (as God promised to do,) *and thou shalt know the Lord of Hosts hath sent me*: I omit the circumstances of the place. Let us

§. 16. now see what is excepted by our Catechists.

Ad secundum vero quid respondes?

Locum Zechariæ ad hunc modum citant: hoc dicit Dominus Exercituum; Post gloriam misit me ad gentes, quæ vos spoliarunt: qui enim vos tangit, tangit pupillam oculi mei, &c. Quæ ad Christum torquent, quod hic ut arbitrantur, dicatur, dominum exercituum missum esse a Domino exercituum. Verum ea hic non habentur; quod hinc perspicuum est, quod ea verba,

What dost thou answer to this second Testimony?

"The place of *Zechary* they thus cite. This "saith the Lord of Hosts; after the Glory hath "he sent me to the Nations which spoyled you; "for he that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of "mine eye; which they wrest unto Christ; because "here as they suppose, it is said, that the Lord of "Hosts is sent from the Lord of Hosts. But these "things are not so; for it is evident that these "words, after the Glory he hath sent me, are "spoken of another, namely of the Angell, who "spake with *Zechariah*, and the other Angell; the same

"same is evident in the same Chapter a little be-
"fore, beginning at the 4. v. where the Angell
"is brought in speaking; which also is to be seen
"from hence, that those words which they cite, *it is*
"saith the *Lord of Hosts*, in the Hebrew may be
"read, thus said the Lord of Hosts, and those,
"*toucheth the apple of mine eye*, may be read, the apple
"of his eye; which of necessity are referred to his
"Messenger, and not to the Lord of Hosts.

post gloriam misit me &c: sunt ab alio prolata, nempe ab Angelo, qui cum Zecharia & alio Angelo colloquebatur, ut idem eodem capite paulo ante planum est, a versu quarto initio facto, ubi is Angelus loquens introducitur. Quod idem ea ex re videre est, quod ea quæ citant verba, hoc dicit Dominus exercituum, in Hebræo leguntur sic dicit Dominus exercituum item illa, tangit pupillam oculi mei, legantur pupillam oculi ejus, quæ non ad Dominum exercituum, sed ad Legatum referri necesse est.

These *Gentlemen* being excellent at *cavils* and *exceptions*, and thereupon undertaking to answer any thing in the world, doe not lightly acquit themselves more weakely, and *jejunely* in any place then in this. For §. 17.

1. We contend not with them about the translation of the words, their exceptions being to the *vulgar Latine* only: We take them as they have rendred them. To omit that therefore,

2. That these words are spoken by him, who is *called the Angell*, we grant; but the only question is, who is this *Angell* that speakes them: It is evident from the former Chapter, and this, that it is *the man, who was upon the red horse*, 1. Chap. 8. v. who is called *Angelus Jehovæ*, v. 11. and makes *Intercession* for the Church v. 12 which is the *proper Office* of Jesus Christ; and that he is no *created Angell*, but *Iehovah* himselfe, the second person of the Trinity, we *prove*, because he calls himselfe the *Lord of Hosts*; saies he *will destroy his enemies with the shaking of his hand*, that he will *convert a people*, and make them *his people*, and that he will *dwell in his Church*, and yet unto all this he adds *three times*, that he is *sent of the Lord of Hosts*. We confesse then all these things to be spoken of him, who was *sent*, but upon all these Testimonies conclude, that he who was sent was the *Lord of Hosts*. §.18.

Grotius interprets all this place of an *Angell*, and names him to boote. *Michael* it is; but who that *Michaell* is, and whither he be no more then an *Angell*, that is, a Messenger, He enquires not. §. 19.

That

Bereschith Rab. ad gen. 25.28.

That the ancient * *Iewish* Doctors interpreted this place of the *Messiah*, is evident. Of that no notice here is taken, it is not to the purpose in hand. To the reasons already offered, to prove that it is no meer Creature that is here intended, but the *Lord of Hosts*, who is sent by the *Lord of Hosts*, I shall only adde my desire, that the friends and *Apologizers* for this learned *Annotatour* would reconcile this exposition of this place to its selfe, in those things which at first view present themselves to every ordinary observer. Take one instance. Ye shall know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me, that is, *Michaell*. And I will dwell in the middest of thee; *Templū meū ibi habebo. I will have my temple there.* If he who speakes be *Michael*, a *Created Angell*, how comes the *Temple of Jehovah* to be his? and such let the attempts of all appeare to be, who mannage any designe against the eternall glory of the Sonne of God.

§. 20. The 3 *Testimony* is 1 *Joh.* 5.20. *And we know that the Sonne of God is come, and hath given us understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Sonne Iesus Christ; This is the true God and eternall life.*

Quid respondes ad tertium? In hoc Testimonio, scimus filium Dei venisse &c. Hæc verba, hic est verus deus, nego referri ad dei Filium; non quod negē Christum esse verum deum; sed quod is locus ea de Christo accipi non admittat: Etenim hic agitur non solum de vero deo; sed de illo uno vero deo, ut articulus in Græco additus indicat. Christus vero etsi verus deus sit, non est tamen ille ex se unus deus, qui per se & perfectissima ratione deus est, cum is deus tantū sit Pater. Nec vero quicquam juvat Adversarios qui propterea hæc ad Christum referri volunt, quod verba, Hic est verus deus, & Christi mentio proxime antecesserit. Etenim pronomina re-

What dost thou answer to this?

"These words, *this is the True God*, I deny to be "referred to the Sonne of God. Not that I deny "Christ to be true God: but that that place will not "admit those words to be understood of Christ: "for here he treats not only of the the true God, "but of the only true God, as the article added "in the Greeke doth declare. But Christ, al-"though he be true God, he is not yet of himselfe "that one God, who by himselfe, and upon the "most excellent account is God, seeing that is "only God the Father. Nor doth it availe the "Adversaries, who would have those words re-"ferred to Christ, because the mention of Christ "doth immediately goe before those words, "this is the true God. For pronounce relatives as "this and the like, are not alwayes referred to "the next Antecedents, but often to that which "is chiefely spoken of, as *Acts* 7.19, 20. *John* 2.7.

from

"from which places it appeares, that the pro-
"noune relative, this, is referred not to the next,
"but to the most remote person.

lativa, ut hic & similia, non semper ad proxime antecedentia, verum sæpenumero ad id, de quo potissimum sermo est, referuntur, ut patet ex his locis, Act. 7. 19, 20. & Act. 10. 6. Joh. 2. 7. e quibus locis apparet, pronomen relativum hic non ad proxime antecedentes personas, sed ad remotiores refert.

§. 21. 1. It is well, it is acknowledged, that the only *true God* is here intended: and that this is proved by the *prefixed Article*, this may be of use afterward.

2. In what sence these men grant Christ to be *a true God*, we know: a *made God*, a *God by office*, not nature: a man *Deified* with Authority; so making *two true Gods*, contrary to innumerable expresse Texts of Scripture, and the *Nature* of the Deity.

§. 22. 3. That those words are not *meant of Christ*, they prove, because He is not the *only true God*, but only the Father: but *Friends!* these words are produced to prove the contrary; as expresly affirming it; and is it a sufficient Reason to deny it, by saying, *He is not the only true God, therefore these words are not spoken of him*; When the Argument is, these words are spoken of him, therefore He is the only true God.

§. 23. 4. Their instances prove, that in some cases a *Relative* may *relate* to the more remote Antecedent, but that in this place, that mentioned ought to do so, they pretend not once to urge: yea their Reason they give is against themselves; namely, that it refers to him chiefely spoken of, which here is eminently, and indisputably *Jesus Christ*. In the places by them produced, it is impossible from the subject matter in hand, that the *Relative* should be referred to any but the remoter Antecedent; but that therefore here we must offer violence to the words, and straine them into an *Incoherence*, and transgresse all rules of construction, (nothing enforcing to such a proceedure) is not proved.

§. 24. 5 In the beginning of the 20. verse it is said, the *Sonne of God is come, and hath given us an understanding*: and we are said to be *in him*, even *in Jesus Christ*, on which it immediately followes, οὗτος, *this, this Jesus Christ is the true God and eternall Life.*

§. 25. 6. That Jesus Christ is by *John* peculiarly called *Life*, and *Life Eternall*, is evident both from his *Gospell*, and this *Epistle*;

and without doubt, by the same terme, in his usuall manner. He expresses here the same person; Chap. 1. v. 2. *The Sonne of God is Life, eternall Life, He that hath the Sonne, hath life; we are in him, the Sonne Jesus Christ, this is the true God, and Eternall Life:* so he began, and so he ends his Epistle.

§. 26. And this is all our Adversaries have to say against this most expresse Testimony of the Divine nature of Jesus Christ; in their entrance whereunto they cry *haile Master*, as one before them did, (*he is a true God,*) but in the close *betray* him (as farre as lyes in them) by denying his divine nature.

§. 27. Even at the light of this most evident Testimony the eyes of *Grotius* dazled, that he could not see the Truth: His note is, οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς. *is nempe quem Iesus monstravit, colendumq; docuit, non alius.* οὗτος *sæpe refertur ad aliquid præcedens non* ἀμέσως. *Act.* 8. 19. 10. 6. The very same plea with the former: only *Acts* 8. 19. is mistaken for *Acts* 7. 19. the place urged by our *Catechists*, & before them by *Socinus* against *Wicke*, to whom not only they, but *Grotius* is beholding. That citation of *Acts* 10. 6. helps not the businesse at all: οὗτος is twice used, once immediately at the beginning of the verse, secondly being guided by the *first*, the latter is referred to the same Person, nor can possibly signify any other. Here is no such thing. Not any one circumstance to cause us, to put any force upon the Constructure of the words: the discourse being still of the same Person without any Alteration: which in the other places is not.

§. 28. Of the next Testimony, which is from those words of *Iude*, *denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Iesus Christ*, v. 4. (not to increase words) this is the summe. There being but *one Article prefixed* to all the words, it seemes to carry the sence, that it is wholy spoken of Christ. The Catechists reckon some places, where one *Article* serves to sundry things, as *Math.* 21. 12. but it is evident, that they are utterly things of another *kind*, and another manner of speaking, then what is here: but the judgment hereof is left to the Reader; it being not indeed cleare to me, whether Christ be called δεσπότης any where in the New Testament, though he be *Lord and God*, and the *true God*, full often.

§. 29. The 2 of *Titus* 13. must be more fully insisted on: *Looking for the*

the blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

What can then Answer to this?

"In this place they strive to evince by two "Reasons, that the Epithite of the Great God is "referred to Christ. The first is the rule fore-"mentioned, of one Article prefixed to all the "words: the other, that we doe not expect that "coming of the Father, but of the Son. To the "first you have an Answer already, in the An-"swer to the Fourth Testimony; To the other I "Answer, *Paul* doth not say, expecting the com-"ing of the Great God, but expecting the ap-"pearance of the Glory of the Great God. But "now the words of Christ shew, that the Glory "of God the Father may be said to be illustra-"ted, when Christ comes to judgement; where-"as he saith, that he shall come in Glory, that "is, with the glory of God his Father, *Math.* 16. 27. *Mark.* 8. 38. Besides, what inconvenience is "it, if it shall be said, that God the Father shall "come, (as they cite the words out of the vul-"gar) when the Son comes to judge the World? "shall not Christ sustaine the Person of the Fa-"ther, as of him from whom he hath received "this office of judging?

Ad quintum quid respondes?

Quintum Testimonium est: Expectantes beatam spem &c. Quo in loco epitheton magni dei ad Christum referri duabus rationibus evincere conantur: Prior est superius, de articulo uno præfixa regula. Posterior, quod adventum non expectemus Patris, sed Filii. Verum ad primum argumentum responsum habes in responsione ad quartum testimonium. Ad alterum respondeo, Paulū non dicere, expectantes adventum Magni dei, verum dicere, expectantes apparitionem gloriæ Magni dei. Posse vero dici gloriam Dei patris illustratam iri, cum Christus ad judicium venerit, verba Christi ostendunt, cum ait, quod venturus sit in gloria, id est, cum gloria dei Patris sui. Math. 16. 27. Marc. 8. 38. *præterea, quod est inconveniens si dicatur, Deus pater venturus (prout illi è vulgata ajunt) cum Filius ad mundum judicandum venerit? An Christus Dei patris personam, in judicio mundi, tanquam ejus, a quo munus judicandi accepit, non sustinebit?*

About the *Reading* of the words, with them we shall not contend; It is the *Originall* we are to be tryed by, and there is in that no ambiguity. That ἐπιφάνεια δόξης, the *Appearance of the Glory*, is an *Hebraisme*, for the *Glorious Appearance*, cannot be questioned. An hundred expressions of that nature in the New Testament, may be produced to give countenance to this. That the *blessed Hope* looked for, is the *thing hoped* for, the Resurrection to life and immortality, is not denyed. Neither is it disputed whether the *subject* spoken of be Iesus Christ, and his *coming to judgment*. The subject is *one*; his *Epithites* here *two*. 1. That belonging to §. 30.

his *Essence* in *himselfe*, He is *the Great God*. 2. That of Office unto *us*: *He is our Saviour*. That it is Christ which is spoken of, appears. 1. From the single *Article* that is assigned to all the words: τῦ μεγάλυ Θεῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησῦ Χριστῦ, which no lesse signifies *one person*, then that other expression, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ Ἰησῦ Χριστῦ, *the God and Father of Jesus Christ*: Should I say, that *one* Person is here intended, and not *two*, (God, and the Father of Jesus Christ being the same) our *Catechists* may say no; for it is found in another place, that there is but *one Article* prefixed, where *sundry* Persons are after spoken of. But is it not evident in those places from the *subject* matter, that they are sundry Persons, as also from the severall conditions of them mentioned, as in that of *Math*: 21.12. *he cast out the sellers and buyers*. The proper force then of the expression enforces this Attribution to Iesus Christ. 2. Mention is made τῆς ἐπιφανείας, of the glorious appearance of *him*, of whom the Apostle speaks. That Christ is the Person spoken of, and his Employment of *coming to judgement*, primarily and directly, is confessed. This *word* is never used of God the *Father*, but frequently of Christ, and that in particular, in respect of the thing here spoken of. Yea it is properly expressive of his *second coming*, in opposition to his *first* coming under contempt, scorne, and reproach, 1 Tim. 6. 14. *Keep this commandement* μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας τῦ Χριστῦ: 2 Tim. 4. 18. *which the* Lord *the Righteous judge shall give me at that day, and not to me only, but to them that love* τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτῦ. Neither (as was said) is it ever used of the Father, but is the *Word* continually used to expresse the *second coming* of Iesus Christ; sometimes παρουσία hath the same signification, and is therefore never ascribed to the Father. 3. It is not what MAY be said to be done, whether the Glory of the Father *may be said* to be illustrated by the coming of Christ, but what IS said: *The Glorious Appearance of the Great God* is not the manifestation of his Glory, but his Glory is manifested in his Appearance. 4. It is true, it is said that Christ shall come *in the Glory of his Father*, *Mark*. 16. 21: *Mark*. 8. 38. but it is no where said, that the *Glory of the Father shall come* or *appeare*. 5. Their whole Interpretation of the words will scarce admit of any good sence; nor can it be properly said, that *two Persons come*, when only *one* comes, though that *one* have Glory and Authority from the other. 6. Christ shall also judge

in

in his owne Name, and by the *Laws*, which as Lord he hath given. 7. There is but the same way of *coming*, and Appearance of the Great God, and our Saviour, which if our Saviour come *really*, and indeed, and the Great God only because he *sends* him; the *one comes*, and the *other comes not*; which is not doubtlesse they *both* come.

Grotius agrees with our *Catechists*; but saies not *one word* more for the proof of *his* interpretation, nor in way of exception to *ours*, then they say: as they say no more then *Socinus* against *Bellarmine*; nor He much more then *Erasmus* before him; from whom *Grotius* also borrowed his consent of *Ambrose*, which he urges in the exposition of this place; which, were it not for my *peculiar respect* to *Erasmus*, I would say were not *honestly* done, himselfe having proved that *comment* under the name of *Ambrose*, to be a Paltry, corrupted, depraved, foysted piece; but *Grotius* hath not a word but what hath been spoken to. §. 31.

The next Testimony mentioned is *Revel.* 1.8. *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* To which is added that of Chap. 4.8. *Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.* §. 32.

What saist thou to this?

"This place, they say, referres to Christ, because they suppose none is said to come but "only Christ, for he is to come to judge the "quick and dead. But it is to be noted, that "that word, which they have rendered to come, "may equally be rendred, is to be, as *Ioh.* 16.13. "Where the Lord saies of the Spirit, which he "promised to the Apostles, that he should shew "them things to come; and *Act.* 18.21. we read, "that the Feast day was to be, in which place "the Greek word is ἐρχόμενον. Lastly, who is "there that knowes not, that seeing it is said before, which was and is, this last which is "added, may be rendred *to be*, that the words "in every part may be taken of existence, and "not in the two former mention of existence, in

Quid ad sextum respondes?

Eum vero locum propterea ad Christum referunt, quod arbitrentur neminem venturum, nisi Christum. Is enim venturus est ad judicandum vivos & mortuos. Verum tenendum est, eam vocem quam illi reddidere, venturus est, reddi & què posse, futurus est. ut Ioan. 16. 13. ubi Dominus ait de Spiritu, quem Apostolis promiserat, quod illis esset futura annunciaturus; & Act. 18. 21. ubi legimus, diem festum futurum: in utrius locis duobus, vox Graeca est ἐρχόμενον. Deinde, quis est qui nesciat, cum prius dictum sit, qui erat, & qui est, & posterius hoc, quod additum est,

the

"the latter of coming. Neither is there any one "who doth not observe, that the Eternity of "God is here described, which comprehendeth "time past, present, and to come. But that "which discovers this grosse errour, is that, *Re-* "*vel.* 1.4,5. where we read, Grace be to you, "and Peace from him which is, which was, and "which is to come; and from the seaven Spirits "which are before His Throne, and from Jesus "Christ, who is the faithfull witnesse. From "which Testimony it appears, that Jesus Christ "is quite another from him, which is, and was, "and is to be, or as they think, is to come.

per futurum esse reddi debere, ut ubiq; de existentia ea oratio accipiatur; & non in prioribus duobus membris de existentia, in postremo de adventu. Nec est qui sit quam qui non animadvertat hic describi æternitatem Dei, quæ tempus præteritum, præsens, & futurum comprehendit. Sed quod crassum errorem hunc detegit, est quod Apoc. 1.4,5. *legimus. Gratia vobis, & pax ab eo, qui est, & qui erat, & qui futurus est, & a septem spiritibus, qui sunt ante faciem throni ejus, & a* Jesu Christo, *qui est testis fidelis. E quo testimonio appareat, Jesum Christum ab eo, qui est, qui erat, & qui futurus est, vel, ut illi credunt, venturus, esse longe alium.*

§. 33. 1. There is not *one* place which they have mentioned, wherein the word here used, ἐρχόμενος, may not properly be translated to *come*, which they seem to acknowledge at first to be peculiar to Christ: but 2. These *Gentlemen* make themselves and their Disciples *merry*, by perswading them, that we have *no other* Argument to prove these words to be spoken of Christ, but only because he is said to be ὁ ἐρχόμενος, which yet in *conjunction* with other things is not without its weight, being as it were a * name of the *Messiah*, *Math.* 11.3. from *Gen.* 49. 10. though it may be otherwise applied. 3. They are no lesse *triumphant* doubtlesse in their following Answer, that these words describe the *Eternity of God*, and therefore belong not to Christ, when the Argument is, that Christ is God, because amongst other things these words ascribe *Eternity to him*: is this an Answer to us, who not only believe him, but prove him Eternall? 4. And they are upon the same *pin* still, in their last expression, that these words are ascribed to the Father, v. 4. when they know that the Argument which they have undertaken to Answer, is, that the same *names are ascribed to the Son*, as to the Father, and therefore he is God equall with him. Their Answer is, this name is not ascribed to Christ, because it is ascribed to the Father. Men must *begge*, when they can make no earnings at work. 5. We confesse Christ to be *alius*, another, another Person from the

* Ἕως ἐλθῃ ᾧ ἀπόκειται. *Gen.* 49.10. οὐ ἐι ὁ ἐρχόμενος. *Mat.* 11.3.

the Father; not another God, as our Catechists pretend.

Having stopt the mouthes of our *Catechists*, we may briefly consider the Text it selfe. That by this expression, *who is, and who was, and who is to come*, the Apostle expresses that name of God, *Ehejeh*, *Exod.* 3.14. which as the Rabbins say, is of all *seasons*, and expressive of all times, is evident. To which adde that other name of *God, Almighty*, and it cannot at all be questioned, but that *He*, who is intended in these words, is the *only true God*. 2. That the words are here used of Jesus Christ, is so undeniable from the Context, that *his* Adversaries thought good not once to mention it: v. 7. His coming is described in Glory: *Behold He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all kindreds of the Earth shall waile because of him*: whereupon himselfe immediately addes the words of this Testimony, *I am Alpha and Omega*: for 1. They are words spoken to *John* by him who gave him the *Revelation*, which was Iesus Christ: v. 1. 2. They are the words of him that speaks *on* to *John*, which was Iesus Christ, v. 18. 3. Iesus Christ twice in this Chapter afterwards gives himselfe the same title, v. 11. *I am Alpha and Omega*; and v. 17. *I am the first and the last*; But who was He? *I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold I live for evermore, Amen: and have the keys of Hell and death*, v. 18. He gave the Revelation; He is described; He speaks all allwaies; He gives himselfe the same Titles *twice* againe in this Chapter. §. 34.

But our *Catechists* think they have taken a course to prevent all this, and therefore have avoided the consideration of the *words*, as they are placed, Chap. 1. v. 8. considering the *same words* in Chap. 4.8. where they want some of the circumstances, which in this place give light to their Application. They are not there spoken by any that ascribes them to himselfe, but by others are ascribed *to him that sits on the Throne*, who cry (as the *Seraphims Isa.* 6.3) *Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which is, which was, and which is to come*. But yet there wants not evidence to evince, that these words belong immediately in this place also to Iesus Christ. For 1. They are the name (as we have seen) whereby not long before he reveals himselfe. 2. They are spoken of him, who *sits on the Throne*, in the midst of the Christian Churches here represented. And if Christ be not intended §. 35.

tended in these words, there is no mention of his *presence* in his Church, in that solemne Representation of its Assembly, although he promised to be in the *middest* of his, *to the end of the World*. 3. The honour that is here ascribed to him that is spoken of, is because he is ἄξιος, *worthy*, as the same is assigned to the *Lamb*, by the *same* persons, in the *same* words, Chap. 5. 12. So that in both these places it is Iesus Christ who is described; *He is, He was, He is to come*, (or as another place expresses it, *the same yesterday, to day, and for ever*) *the Lord God Almighty*.

§. 36. I shall not need to adde any thing to what *Grotius* hath observed on these places. He holds with our *Catechists*, and ascribes these Titles, and Expressions to God, in contradistinction to *Jesus Christ*, and gives in some observations to explain them: but for the Reason of his exposition, wherein he knew that he dissented from the most of Christians, we have נֵאוּ נְגוּ: so that I have nothing to do, but to reject his *Authority*; which upon the experience I have of his designe, I can most freely doe.

§. 37. Proceed we to the next Testimony, which is *Act.* 20. 28. *feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* He who purchased the Church with his blood, is *God*: but it was Jesus Christ, who purchased his Church with his blood: *Ephes.* 5. 25, 26, 27. *Tit.* 2. 14. *Heb.* 9, 14. Therefore He is God.

Quid ad septimum respondes?

Respondeo, nomen Dei hoc loco non referri ad Christum necessario, sed ad ipsum Deum Patrem referri posse, cujus Apostolus, eum sanguinem, quem Christus fudit, sanguinem vocat, eo genere loquendi, & eam ob causam, quo genere loquendi, & quam ob causam propheta ait, eum qui tangit populum Dei, tangere pupillam oculi Dei ipsius. Etenim summa, quæ est inter Deum patrem & Christum conjunctio, etsi essentia sint prorsus diversi, in causa est, cur Christi sanguis, sanguis

What dost thou answer to this?

"I answer, the name of God is not necessarily "in this place referred to Christ, but it may be "referred to God the Father: whose blood the "Apostles call that which Christ shed, in that "kind of speaking, and for that cause, with which "God, and for which cause the Prophet sayes, he "who toucheth you, toucheth the apple of the eye "of God himselfe. For the great conjunction "that is between Father and Sonne, although in "Essence they are altogether diverse, is the reason, "why the blood of Christ is called the blood of "God the Father himselfe, especially if it be con-"sidered as shed for us. For Christ is the Lamb of "God, that takes away the sinnes of the world. "Whence the blood shed to that purpose may be called

"called the blood of God himself. Nor is it to "be passed by in silence, that in the Syriach edi- "tion, in the place of God, Christ is read.

ipsius Dei Patris dicatur: praesertim si quis expendat quatenus is est pro nobis fusus. Etenim Christus est agnus Dei, qui tollit peccata Mundi. Unde sanguis in eum finem fusus, ipsius dei sanguis jure vocari potest. Nec vero praetereundum est silentio, quod in editione Syriaca loco dei legatur Christi.

§. 38. There is scarce any place, in returning an answer whereunto, the Adversaries of the Deity of Christ do lesse *agree* among themselves, then about this. Some say the name of God is not here taken *absolutely*, but with relation to *Office*, and so Christ is spoken of, and called *God by Office*: So *Socin. ad Bellar. & Wieck. pag.* 200. *&c.* Some, that the words are thus to be read: *Feed the Church of God, which Christ hath purchased by his own blood:* So *Ochinus and Lælius Socinus, whom Zanchius* Answers: *de tribus Elohim. lib.* 3. *cap.* 6. *p.* 456.

§. 39. Some fly to the *Syriach* Translation, contrary to the constant consenting Testimony of all famous copyes of the *Originall*, all agreeing in the word θεοῦ, some adding τῆς κυρίου: so *Grotius* would have it; affirming that the *manuscript* he used had τῆς κυρίου; not telling them that it added θεοῦ, which is the same with what we affirme. And therefore he ventures at asserting the Text to be corrupted, and in short writing, θυ to be crept in for χυ, contrary to the *Faith*, and *consent* of all ancient copies which is all he hath to plead. 2. Our *Catechists* know not what to say; *necessarily* this word God is not to be referred to Christ; it *may* be referred to God the Father. Give an instance of the like phrase of speech, and take the interpretation. Can it be said that *ones* blood was shed, when it was *not shed*, but anothers, and no mention that that others blood was shed? 3. If the Fathers blood was shed, or said truly to be shed, because Christs blood was shed; Then you may say, that *God* the *Father dyed*, and was *crucifyed* under *Pontius Pilate*, and God the Father rose *from the dead*, that he *was dead*, and is *alive*: That that blood that was shed, was not Christs, but some bodyes else, that he loved & was neere unto him. 4. There is no *Analogy* between that of the Prophet, of the *Apple of Gods eye*, and this here spoken of. Uncontrolably a *Metaphor* must there be allowed: here is no *metaphor* insisted on; but that which is the blood of Christ, is called the blood of God, and Christ *not* to be that God is their inter-

pretation. There diverse persons are spoken of, God and Believers: here one only, that did that which is expressed. And all the force of this exposition lyes in this, *there is a figurative expression in one place, the matter spoken of requiring it, therefore here must be a figure admitted also, where there is not the same reason*: what is this butt o make the Scripture a *nose of wax*? This worke of *redeeming the Church with his blood*, is ever ascribed to *Christ*, as peculiar to him, constantly without exception; and never to God the Father: neither would our Adversaries allow it to be so here, but that they know not how to stand before the Testimony wherewith they are pressed.

§. 40. 5. If because of the *conjunction* that is between God the Father and Christ, the Blood of Christ may be called the *blood of God* the Father; then the *hunger and thirst of Christ, his dying and being buried, his rising againe*, may be called the hunger and thirst of God the Father, his sweating, dying, and rising. And he is a strange naturall and proper Sonne, who hath a quite different nature and essence from his own proper Father, as is here affirmed.

6. Christ is called the *Lamb* of God, as answering and fullfilling all the Sacrifices, that were made to God of old: and if the blood of Christ may be called the blood of God the Father, because he appointed it to be shed for us: then the blood of any Sacrifice was also the blood of a man, that appointed it to be shed, yea of God, who ordained it. The words are, ἐκκλησίαν θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος; if any words in the world can properly expresse, that it is one and the same person intended, that it is his own blood *properly*, that bought the Church with it, surely these words do it to the full. *Christ then is God.*

§. 41. The next place they are pleased to take notice of, as to this head of Testimonies, about the *name of God*, is 1 *Joh.* 3. 16. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.* He who laid down his life for us *was God*: that is, he was so when he laid down his life for us, and not made a God since.

Ad octavum vero quid? Primum igitur sic habeto, neq; in Græcâ editione ullâ, (excepta complutensi) nec in editione Syriacâ, vocem De-

To the eight what saist thou?

"First take this account, that neither in any "Greeke edition, but only the *Complutensis*, nor "in the *Syriach*, the word *God* is found; but sup-

pose

"pose that this word were found in all copies, "were therefore this word He to be referred to "God? Not doubtlesse; not only for that Rea- "son which we gave a little before, in answer to "the third Testimony, that such words are not "alwaies referred to the next person; but "moreover, because *John* doth often in this "Epistle referre the Greeke word ἐκεῖνος to him "who was named long before, as in the 3, 5, and "7. verses of this Chapter.

us haberi. Verum etiamsi hæc vox haberetur in omnibus exemplaribus, num idcirco ea vox ille, ad Deum erit referenda? Non certè; non solum ob eam causam, quam paulo superius attulimus, in responsione ad Testimonium tertium; quod verba ejusmodi non semper ad propinquiores personas referantur: verum etiam quod ἐκεῖνος *vocem Græcam Iohannes in hac Epistola sæpe ad eum refert, qui longe antea nominatus fuerat, ut & 3. 5. & 7. versu ejusdem capitis in Græco apparet.*

§. 42. 1. Our *Catechists* doe very faintly adhere to the first exception about the word θεὸς in the Originall, granting that it is in *some* copies, and knowing that the like phrase is used elsewhere, and that the sence in this place necessarily requires the presence of that word. 2. Supposing it as they doe, we deny, that this is a very just exception which they insist upon, that a *Relative may* sometimes, and in *some* cases, where the sence is evident, be referred to the more *remote* antecedent, therefore it *may*, or *ought* to do so in any place, contrary to the *propriety* of *Grammer*, where there are no circumstances, enforcing such a construction, but all things requiring the proper sence of it. 3. It is allowed of only where *severall* Persons are spoken of immediately before, which here are not; one only being intimated, or expressed. 4. They can give no Example of the word *God*, going before, and ἐκεῖνος following after, where ἐκεῖνος is referred to any *thing* or *Person* more remote: much lesse here where the Apostle having treated of *God*, and the *Love of God*, drawes an Argument from the *Love* of God, to enforce our Love of one another. 5. In the places they point unto, ἐκεῖνος in every of them is referred to the next and immediate Antecedent, as will be evident to the Reader upon the first view.

§. 43. Give them their *great* Associate, and we have done. Ἐκεῖνος *hic est Christus ut supra* v. 5. *subintelligendum hic autem est, hoc Christum fecisse Deo sic decernente nostri causa quod expressum est*, Rom. 4. 8. That ἐκεῖνος is Christ is confessed; but the word being a *Rela-*

tive, & *expressive* of some *person* before mentioned, we say it relates unto θεὸν, the word going immediately before it. No saies *Grotius*, but the sence is, *Herein appeared the love of God, that by his appointment Christ dyed for us.* That Christ laid down his life for us by the appointment of the Father, is most true; but that that is the intendment of this place, or that the *Grammaticall* construction of the words will beare any such sence, we deny.

§. 44. And this is what they have to except to the Testimonies, which themselves choose to insist on, to give in their exceptions to, as to the names of *Jehovah*, and *God*, being ascribed unto Jesus Christ: which having vindicated from all their *Sophistry*, I shall shut up the discourse of them with this Argument, which they afford us for the confirmation of the sacred truth contended for. He who is *Jehovah*, *God*, the *only true God*, &c. He is *God by Nature*: But thus is Jesus Christ God; and these are the names the Scripture calls and knows him by: Therefore He is so, *God by Nature*, blessed for ever.

§. 45. That many *more* Testimonies to this purpose may be produced, and have been so, by those who have pleaded the Deity of Christ, against its opposers, both of *old* and of *late*, is known to all that enquire after such things. I content my selfe, to vindicate what they have put in exceptions unto.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Worke of Creation assigned to Jesus Christ. &c. The confirmation of his Eternall Deity from thence.

§. 1. THe Scriptures, which *assigne the Creating of all things* to Iesus Christ, they propose as the next *Testimony* of his Deity, whereunto they desire to give in their Exceptions. To these they annexe *them*, wherein it is affirmed, that *he brought the people of Israel out of Egypt*, and that he was *with them in the Wildernesse*, with one particular out of *Isaiah*, compared with the account given of it in the Gospell, about the Prophets *seeing the glory of Christ*. Of those which are of the first sort, they instance in *Ioh.* 1. 3.

1.3. & 10. *Col.* 1.16. *Heb.*1.2. & 10,11,12. verses. §. 2.

The *first*, and *second* of these, I have already vindicated in the consideration of them, as they lay in their conjuncture with them going before in v.1. (2.) Proceed we therefore to the third, which is *Col.*1.16. *For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible, and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers; all things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.*

That these words are spoken of Jesus Christ, is acknowledged. The verses foregoing prevent all Question thereof. *He hath translated us into the Kingdome of his deare Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgivenesse of sinnes: who is the Image of the invisible God, the first borne of every creature: for by him were all things &c.* §. 3.

2. In what sence Christ is *the Image of the invisible God*, even the *expresse Image of his Fathers Person*, shall be afterwards declared. The other part of the description of him belongs to that which we have in hand. He is πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως *The first borne of every Creature:* that is, *before them all; above them all; heir* of them all: and so none of them. It is not said, He is πρωτοκτίστος, first created, but πρωτότοκος, the first borne; now the terme *first* in the Scripture, respects either what *followes*, and so denotes an *order* in the things spoken of, He that is the first being one of them, as *Adam* was the *first* man: or it respects things *going before*, in which sence it denyes all *order* or *series* of things in the same kind. So God is said to be the *first*, *Isa.* 41. 4. because before him there is none, *Isa.* 43. 11. And in this sence is Christ the *first borne*; so the *first borne*, as to be the *only begotten sonne of God*, *Joh.*1.14. This the Apostle proves, and gives an account of, in the following verses; for the clearing of his intendment *wherein*, a few things may be premised. §. 4.

1. Though he speaks of *him* who *is* Mediatour, and describes him, yet he speaks not of him *as* Mediatour; for that he enters upon *v.*18. *And He is the head of the body the Church &c.* §. 5.

2. That the things, whose *Creation* are here assigned unto Jesus Christ, are evidently contradistinguished to the things of the *Church*, or new Creation, which are mentioned v. 18. Here he is said to be the *first borne of every Creature*, there the *first borne* §. 6.

from the dead. Here to *make all things*; there to be the *head of the body the Church.*

§. 7. 3. The *Creation of all things, simply,* and *absolutely*, is most *emphatically* expressed. 1. In *General*; *by him all things were created.* 2. A *distribution* is made of those *all things*, into *all things that are in heaven*, and *that are in earth*; which is the common expression of *all things* that were made at the beginning: *Exod.* 20. 11. *Act.* 4. 24. 3. A *description* is given of the things so created, according to two *Adjuncts*, which divide all Creatures whatever, whether they are *visible*, or *invisible*. 4. An *Annumeration* is in particular made of one sort, of things *invisible*, which being of greatest Eminency and Dignity, might seeme, if any, to be exempted from the state and condition of being *created* by Jesus Christ; *whether they be thrones, &c.* 5. This *distribution* and *Annumeration* being closed, the *General* assumption is againe repeated, as having received confirmation from what was said before: *all things were created by him:* of what sort soever, whether expressed in the *Annumeration* foregoing, or no; All things were created by him: and this is amplified by the end of their creation; they were created for him, εἰς αὐτὸν: as it is said of the Father, *Rom.* 11. 36. which *Revel.* 4. 11. is said to be, *for his will and pleasure.* 6. For a farther description of him, v. 17. his *pre-existence* before all things, and his *providence* in supporting them, and continuing that being to them, which he gave them by creation, is asserted. And *He is before all things, and by him all things exist.*

§. 8. Let us consider then what is *excepted* hereunto, by them with whom we have to do. Thus they,

What dost thou answer to this place?

"Besides this, that this Testimony speakes of "Christ, as of the mediate and second cause, it is "manifest, the words [*were created*] are used in the "Scripture, not only concerning the old, but also "the new creation; of which you have example "*Ephes.* 2. 10, 15. *Iames* 1. 18. Moreover, that these "words All things in Heaven and in Earth, are "not used for all things altogether, appeareth "not only from the words subjoyned a little after "*v.* 20. where the Apostle saith, that by him are all

Quid ad tertium? Præter id, quod & hoc testimonium loquatur de Christo, tanquam mediâ & secundâ causâ, verbum creata sunt, *non solum de vetere, verum etiam de nova creatione in Scriptura usurpari constat: cujus rei exempla habes* Ephes. 2. 10, 15. Jacob. 1. 18. *Præterea, ea verba,* omnia in cœlis, & in terra, *non usurpari pro omnibus*

"all things reconciled in Heaven and in earth, but "also from those words themselves, wherein the "Apostle said not, that the Heavens and the Earth "were created, but all things that were in Heaven "and in Earth.

But how dost thou understand that Testimony?

"On that manner, wherein all things that are "in Heaven and in Earth were reformed by "Christ, after God raised him from the dead; "and by him translated into another state & con-"dition, and this whereas God gave Christ to be "head to Angells and men, who before acknow-"ledged God only for their Lord.

prorsus, apparet non solum ex verbis paulo inferius subjectis, v. 20. ubi Apostolus ait, quod per eum reconciliata sint omnia in cœlis & in terra, verum etiam ex iis ipsis verbis, in quibus Apostolus non ait, cœlum & terram creata esse, verum ea omnia quæ in cœlis & in terra sunt.

Qui vero istud testimonium intelligis?

Ad eum modum, quo per Christum omnia, quæ sunt in cœlis & in terra postquam eum Deus a mortuis excitavit, reformata sunt, & in alium statum & conditionem translata; id vero cum Deus & Angelis & hominibus Christum caput dederit, qui antea tantum Deum solum pro domino agnoverant.

What there is either in their *Exceptions*, or *Exposition*, of weight to take of this evident Testimony, shall briefely be considered.

The first exception of the *kind of causality*, which is here ascribed to Christ, hath already been considered and removed, by manifesting the very *same* kind of Expression, about the *same* things, to be used concerning God the Father. 2. Though the word, *Creation*, be used concerning the *New Creation*, yet it is in places where it is evidently and distinctly spoken of, in opposition to the former state, wherein they were, who were *so* created. But here, as was above demonstrated, the *old creation* is spoken of, in direct distinction from the *new*, which the Apostle describes, and expresses in other termes (*v.* 20.) If that may be called the *New Creation*, which layes a foundation of it, as the death of Christ doth of Regeneration. And unlesse it be in *that cause*, the worke of the *New Creation* is not spoken of at all in this place. 3. Where Christ is said *to reconcile all things to himselfe that are in Heaven and earth*, he speakes plainely, and evidently of another worke, distinct from that which he had described in these verses; and where as *Reconciliation* supposes a past *Enmity*, the *All things* mentioned in the 20. verse, can be none, but those which were sometime at *Enmity* with God. Now none but men, that ever had any *enmity* against God, or were at *enmity* with him, were ever reconciled to God. It is then *men in Heaven* and

§. 10.

and Earth, to whose reconciliation in their severall Generations, the efficacy of the blood of Christ did extend, that is there intended. 4. Not *Heaven and Earth* are named, but *all things* in them, as being most immediately expressive of the Apostles purpose, who naming *all things* in generall, chose to instance in *Angells* and *men*: as also insisting on the expression, which is used concerning the Creation of all things in sundry places, as hath been shewed; though he mentions not all the words in them used.

§. 11. For the *Exposition* they give of these words, it is most *ridiculous*, For 1. The Apostle doth not speake of Christ, as he is *exalted* after his Resurrection, but describes him in his *divine* nature and being. 2. To *translate* out of one condition into another, is not to *create* the thing so translated, though another *new thing* it may. When a man is made a *magistrate*, we doe not say he is *made a man*, but he is made a *Magistrate*. 3. The new Creation which they here affirme to be spoken of, is by no meanes to be accommodated unto *Angells*; In both the places mentioned by themselves, and in all places where it is spoken of, it is expressive of a change from *bad* to *good*, from *evill* actions, to *Grace*, and is the same with *Regeneration*, or *Conversion*, which cannot be ascribed to *Angells*, who never sinned, nor lost their *first habitation*. 4. The *Dominion of Christ over Angells and men* is no where called a *new creation*; nor is there any colour or pretence why it should be so expressed. 5. The *New Creation* is in Jesus Christ, 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. but to be in Christ, is to be implanted into him by the Holy Spirit by believing, which by no meanes can be *accommodated* to Angells. 6. If only the *Dominion* of Christ be intended, then whereas *Christs Dominion* is according to our Adversarys (*Smal. de Divin. Christi. cap.* 16.) extended over all Creatures, Men, Angells, Divells, and all other things in the world, then *Men*, *Angells*, *Divells*, *and all things* are new Creatures. 7. *Socinus* saies that by *Principalities*, *and Powers*, *Divells are intended*: and what advancement may they be supposed to have obtained by the *new Creation*? The *Divells* were Created, that is, delivered. There is no end of the folly and absurditys of this interpretation: I shall spend no more words about it. Our Argument from this place stands firme and unshaken.

Ea quæ in cœlis sunt personæ (quæ subjectæ sunt Christo) sunt Angeli, iique tam boni quam mali: quæ in cœlis sunt, & personæ non sunt, omnia illa continent quæcunq; extra Angelos vel sunt, vel etiam esse possunt. Smal. de Divin. Christi cap. 16. de Regno Christi super Angelos.

Grotius

Grotius abides by his Friends in the Interpretation of this place, wresting it to the *new Creature*, and the Dominion of Christ over all; against all the reasons formerly insisted on, and with no other Argument then what he was from the *Socinians* supplyed withall. His words on the place are. *It is certaine, that all things were created by the word. But those things that goe before shew that Christ is here treated of, which is the name of a man. As Chrysostome also understood this place: but he would have it, that the world was made for Christ, in a sence not corrupt: but on the account of that which went before, ἀντίδοσιν is better interpreted, were ordained, or obtained a certaine new state.* So He, in almost the very words of *Socinus*. But §. 12.

Certum est, per verbum creata omnia. Sed quæ præcedunt, ostendunt hic de Christo agi, quod hominis nomen est, quemodo etiam Chrysostomus hunc accepit locum. Sed ille intelligit mundum creatum propter Christum, sensu non malo: sed propter id quod præcessit, rectius est ἀντίδοσιν hic interpretatari, ordinata sunt, novum quendam statum sunt consecuta.

1. In what sence all things were created by the *Word*, and what *Grotius* intends by the *Word*, I shall speake elsewhere. 2. Is Christ the *name of a man only*? Or of him who is *only* a man? Or is he a man only as he is Christ? If he would have spoken out to this, we might have had some light into his meaning, in many other places of his *Annotations*. The Apostle tels us that Christ *is over all, God blessed for ever*, Rom. 9.5. And that Jesus Christ was *declared to be the Son of God by the Resurrection from the dead*, Ro. 1.3. If Christ denote the *Person* of our Mediatour, Christ *is God*, and what is spoken of Christ, is spoken of him who is God. But this is that which is aimed at; The *Word*, or Wisdome of God, beares eminent *favour* towards that man *Jesus Christ*: but that he was any more then a man, (that is, the Union of the natures of God and man in one person) is denyed. 3. The words before are so spoken of Christ, as that they call him the *Sonne of God*, and the *Image of the invisible God*, and the *first borne of the Creation*: which though *He* was, who was a man, yet he was not, *as* he was a man. 4. All the Arguments we have insisted on, and farther shall insist on (by Gods assistance) to prove the Deity of Christ, with all the Texts of Scripture wherein it is plainely affirmed, do evince the vanity of this exception, *Christ is the name of a man, therefore the things spoken of him are not proper and peculiar to God.* 5. Into *Chrysostomes* Exposition of this place I shall not at present enquire, though I am

not without reason to think he is *wronged*: but that the word here, [*created,*] may not, cannot be rendred *ordained*, or *placed* in a new state and condition, I have before sufficiently evinced; neither doth *Grotius* adde any thing to evince his interpretation of the place, or to remove what is objected against it.

§. 13. 1. He tells us, that *of that sence of the word* κτίζειν, *he hath spoken in his prolegomena*. And urges *Ephes.* 2.10, 13. 3.9. 4.24. to prove the sence proposed. It is confessed, that God doth sometimes expresse the *exceeding greatnesse of his power, and efficacy of his Grace*, in the Regeneration of a sinner, and enabling him to live to God, by the word *create*; whence such a person is sometimes called the *new creature*, according to the many promises of the Old Testament, of *creating a new heart* in the Elect, whom He would take into *Covenant* with himselfe. A truth which wraps that in its bowels, whereunto *Grotius* was no Friend. But that this *New Creation* can be accommodated to the things here spoken of, is such a *figment*, as so Learned a man might have been ashamed of. The constant use of the Word in the *new* Testament, is that which is proper, and that which in this place we insist on; as *Rom.* 1. 25. 1 *Tim.* 4.3. *Revel.* 4. 11. (2.) *Ephes.* 2.10. speakes of the *new creature* in the sence declared, which is not illustrated by *v.* 13. which is quite of another import. *Chap.* 4.24. is to the same purpose. *Chap* 3.9. The Creation of *all things*, simply, and absolutely, is ascribed to God; which to wrest to a *new Creation* there is no Reason, but what arises from opposition to Jesus Christ, *because it is ascribed also to him.*

§. 14. The latter part of the verse he thus *illustrates*, or rather *obscures*; τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ: *intellige omnia quæ ad novam creationem pertinent*. How causelessly, how without ground, how contrary to the words, and scope of the place, hath been shewed; καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται: *propter ipsum, ut ipse omnibus præesset*, *Rev.* 5. 13. *Heb.* 2. 8. This is to go forward in an ill way. What one instance can he give of this sence of the expression opened? The words as hath been shewed are used of God the Father, *Rom.* 11.36. and are expressive of absolute soveraignty, as *Rev.* 4. 11. (2.) The Texts cited by him to exemplify the sence of this place, (for they are not instanced in to explaine the *phrase*, which is not used in them) do quite evert his whole Glosse: In both places the Dominion of Christ is asserted over the whole Creation;

and

and particularly in *Revel.* 5. 13. *things in Heaven, Earth, under the Earth,* and in the *Sea,* are recounted. [illegible] whether all these are made *new Creatures,* or no? If not; it is not the Dominion of Christ over them, that is here spoken of; for he speaks only of them that *He Created.*

Of the 17. v. he gives the same expofition; καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστι πρὸ πάντων: *id est,* Α & Ω, *ut alt Apocal.* 1. 8. πρὸ πάντων, *intellige ut jam diximus.* Not contented to pervert this place, he drawes another into society with it; wherein he is more highly engaged then our *Catechists,* who confesse that place to be spoken of the Eternity of God. καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε: *& hæc vox de veteri creatione ad novam traducitur; vid.* 2 *Pet.* 3. 5. Prove it by any *one* instance; or if that may not be done, *begge* no more in a matter *of* this importance. In *Peter* it is used of the *existence* of all things by the power of God, in, and upon their Creation; and so also here, but spoken with reference to Jesus Christ, who is *God over all blessed for ever.* And so much for the vindication of this Testimony. §. 15.

Heb. 1. 2. is nextly mentioned: *By whom also he made the worlds.* §. 16.

That these words are spoken of Christ, is not denyed. They are too *expresse* to beare any exception on that account. That God is said to make the World *by Christ,* doth not at all prejudice what we intend from this place. God could no way *make the World* by Christ, but as he was his own *Eternall Wisdome,* which exempts him from the condition of a creature. Besides, as it is said, that God made the World *by him,* denoting the *subordination* of the Sonne to the Father, and his being his *Wisdome,* as He is described *Prov.* 8. So also the *Word* is said to *make the World,* as a principall efficient cause himselfe, *Ioh.* 1. 3. and *Heb.* 1. 10. The word here used is αἰῶνας. That αἰὼν is of various Acceptations in the New Testament, is known. A *duration* of time, an *Age, Eternity,* are sometimes expressed thereby. The *World,* the *beginning* of it, or its Creation as *Ioh.* 9. 32. In this place it signifies not *Time* simply, and solely, but the things created in the beginning of time, and in all times: and so expresly the word is used, *Heb.* 11. 2. the framing αἰώνων, is the *creation of the World,* which by faith we come to know. *The Worlds,* that is, the World, and all in it, *was made by Christ.*

§. 17. Let us now heare our Catechists.

Qui respondes ad quartum testimonium?

How doest thou answer to this Testimony?

Eo pacto, quod hic palam Scriptum sit, non, Christum feciſſe, ſed, Deum per Chriſtum feciſſe ſecula. Vocem vero ſecula *non ſolum præſentia & præterita, verum etiam futura ſignificare poſſe, in confeſſo eſt. Hic vero de futuris agi id demonſtrat, quod idem Autor affirmet, per eum, quem hæredem univerſorum conſtituerit Deus, etiam ſecula eſſe condita. Nam Jeſus Nazarenus non prius conſtitutus hæres univerſorum fuit, quam eum Deus a mortuis excitavit. Quod hinc patet, quod tum demum omnis poteſtas in Cælo & in terra eidem data a Deo Patre fuerit, cujus poteſtatis donatione, & non alia re, iſta univerſorum hæreditas continetur.*

"On this manner, that it is here openly written, not that Christ made, but that God by "Christ made the worlds. It is also confessed, that "the word *secula*, may signify not only the Ages "past, and present, but also to come. But that "here it signifies things future is demonstrated "from hence, that the same Author affirmeth, that "by him whom God appointed Heire of al things, "he made the worlds. For Jesus of Nazareth was "not made Heire of all things before he raised "him from the dead: which appeares from "hence, because then all power in Heaven and "in earth was given him of God the Father, in "which grant of power, and not in any other "thing, that inheritance of all things is conteined.

For the first exception, it hath been sufficiently spoken to already: and if nothing else but the *preexistence* of Christ unto the whole creation be hence proved, yet the cause of our Adversaryes is by it destroyed for ever. This exception might do some service to the *Arians*, to *Socinians* it will do none at all. 2. The word *Jecula* signifyes not *things future any where*. This is *gratis dictum*, and cannot be proved by any instance. The *world to come* may do so, but the *world* simply doth not. That it doth not so signify in this place, is evident from these considerations. 1. These words, *by whom he made the world*, are given as a Reason, why God made him *Heire of all things*: even because by him he *made all things*: which is no reason at all, if you understand only *Heavenly things* by the *worlds* here: which also removes the last exception of our Catechists, that Christ was appointed *Heire of all things*, antecedently to his making of the worlds; which is most false; this being given as a reason of that; his *making of the world*, of *his being made heire* of all things. Besides, this answer, *that Christ made not the world untill his Resurrection*,

rection, is directly opposite to that formerly given by them to *Col.* 1. 16. where they would have him to be said to *make all things*, because of the Reconciliation he made by his death. *v.* 20. 2. The same word or expression in the same *Epistle* is used for the *world*, in its Creation, as was before observed, *chap.* 11. 2. which makes it evident, that the Apostle in both places intends the same. 3. Αἰών is no where used absolutely for the *world to come*: which being spoken of in this Epistle is once called οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, *Chap.* 2. 5. and αἰῶνα μέλλοντα, *Chap.* 6. 5. but no where absolutely αἰῶνα, or αἰῶνας. 4. The *world to come*, is no where said to be *made*; nor is this expression used of it. It is said *Chap.* 2. to be *put into subjection to Christ, not to be made by him*; and *Chap.* 6. The *powers of it* are mentioned, not its *Creation*. 5. That is said to be *made by Christ*, which he *upholds* with the word of his power; but this is said simply to be *all things*; *he upholdeth all things by the word of his power*, *v.* 3. 6. This plainely Answers the former expressions insisted on: *He made the world*, *He made all things*, &c. So that this Text also lies as a two edged sword, at the very heart of the *Socinian* cause.

§. 18. *Grotius* seeing that this Interpretation could not be made good, yet being no way willing to grant, that *making of the world* is ascribed to Christ, relieves his *Friends* with one evasion more then they were aware of. It is that δι' ὃν, *by whom* is, put for δι' ὃν, *for whom*, or for whose sake. And ἐποίησεν is to be rendred by the *preterplupersect tense*, he *had made*: and so the sence, is *God made the world for Christ*, which Answereth an old saying of the Hebrewes; *That the world was made for the Messiah*.

§. 19. But what will not *great wits* give a colour to? *Grotius* is not able to give me one instance in the whole new Testament, where δι' ὃν is taken for δι' ὃν; and if it should be so any where, himselfe would confesse, that it must have some cogent circumstance to enforce that construction, as *all* places must have where we goe off from the propriety of the word. 2. If δι' ὃν be put for δι' ὃν; διὰ must be put for εἰς, as in the opinion of *Beza* it is once in the place quoted by *Grotius*; and so signify the finall cause, as he makes δι' ὃν to do. Now the Holy Ghost doth expressly distinguish between these two, in this businesse of making the World: *Rom.* 11. 36. δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα. So that doubtlesse in the same matter, *one* of these is not put

for the other. 3. Why must ἐπείνοις be *conditerat*, and what example can be given of so rendring that *Aoristus*? If men may say what they please, without taking care to give the least probability to what they say, these things may passe. 4. If the Apostle must be supposed to allude to any opinion, or saying of the *Jewes*, it is much more probable that he alluded in the word διῶνας, which he uses, to the *threefold* world they mention in their Liturgy: the *lower, middle*, and *higher world*, or soules of the *blessed*. Or the foure fold mentioned by *Rab. Alschech. Messias proiperabitur vocabulum est quod quatuor mundos complectitur: qui sunt mundus inferior, mundus Angelorum, mundus sphærarum, & mundus supremus, &c.* but of this enough.

Though this *last* Testimony be sufficient to confound all *Gainesayers*, & to stop the mouths of men of common ingenuity, yet it is evident, that our *Catechists* are more perplexed with that which followes in the same chapter, which therefore they insist longer upon, then on any one *single* Testimony besides; with what successe comes now to be considered.

§. 20. The words are *Heb.* 1.10,11,12. *And thou Lord in the beginning hast layd the foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the workes of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy yeares shall not faile.* That these words of the *Psalmist* are spoken concerning Christ, we have the Testimony of the Apostle, applying them to him; wherein we are to acquiesce. The thing also is cleare in its selfe, for they are added in his discourse of the deliverance of the Church, which worke is peculiar to the Sonne of God; and where that is mentioned, it is he who eminently is intended. Now very many of the Arguments, wherewith the Deity of Christ is confirmed, are wrapped up in these words. 1. His name *Jehovah* is asserted. And thou *Lord*, for of him the *Psalmist* speakes though he report not that word. 2. His *Eternity* & preexistence to his *incarnation*. Thou *Lord in the beginning*; that is, before the *world was made*. 3. His *Omnipotence*, & *divine power* in the *creation* of all things: *thou hast laid the foundation of the Earth, & the Heavens are the worke of thy hands*. 4. His *immutability*; thou art the *same, and thy yeares faile not*. as Mal. 3.6. 5. His *Soveraignty* and *Dominion over all*, *as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed*

ged. Let us now see what darkenesse they are able to poure forth upon this *Sunne*, shining in its strength.

§. 21.

What dost thou answer to this Testimony?

"To this Testimony I answer, that it is not to be "understood of Christ but of God. But because this "writer refers it to the Son of God, it is to be con-"sidered, that the discourse in this Testimony is ex-"presly about, not one, but two things chiefely: "the one is the Creation of Heaven and Earth; "the other the abolishing of Created things. "Now that that Authour doth not referre the "first unto Christ, is hence evident, because "in that Chapter He proposeth to himselfe to "demonstrate the excellency of Christ above the "Angells, not that which he hath of himselfe, "but that which he had by Inheritance, and "whereby he is made better then the Angells, as "is plaine to any one *v.* 4. of which kind of ex-"cellence seeing that the Creation of Heaven "and Earth is not, nor can be, it appeareth ma-"nifestly, that this Testimony is not urged by "this writer to prove that Christ Created Hea-"ven and Earth. Seeing therefore the first part "cannot be referred to Christ, it appeareth, that "the latter only is to be referred to him: and "that because by him God will abolish Heaven "and Earth, when by him he shall execute the "Last Judgement: whereby the excellency of "Christ above Angells shall be so conspicuous, "that the Angells themselves shall in that very "thing serve him. And seeing this last speech "could not be understood without those former "words, wherein mention is made of Heaven "and Earth, being joyned to them by this word "*they*, therefore the Author had a necessity to "make mention of them also. For if other holy "writers do after that manner cite the Testimo-"nies of Scripture, compelled by no necessity,

Ad quintum quid respondes?

Ad id Testimonium id respondeo, quod non de Christo, verum de Deo accipiendum sit. Quia vero idem Scriptor illud ad Filium Dei referat, expendendum est, Sermonem in Testimonio non de una re sed de duabus potissimum haberi expresse: una est Cæli & terræ creatio; altera rerum creatarum abolitio. Quod vero is autor prierem ad Christum non referat hinc perspicuum est, quod in eo capite præstantiam Christi demonstrare sibi proposuerit, non eam, quam a seipso habeat, verum eam quæ hæreditavit, & qua præstantior Angelis effectus sit, ut e ver. 4. cuivis planum est: cujus generis præstantia cum creatio Cæli & terræ non sit, nec esse possit, apparet manifeste, non in eum finem testimonium ab eo Scriptore allatum, ut Christum creasse Cælum & terram probaret. Cum igitur prior ad Christum referri nequeat, apparet, posteriorem tantum ad eum referendum esse, id vero propterea, quod Deus Cælum & terram per eum abolituras sit, tum cum judicium extremum per ipsum est executurus. Quo quidem tantopere præstantia Christi præ Angelis conspicua futura est, ut ipsi Angeli sint ei ea ipsa in re ministraturi. Quæ posterior oratio, cum sine verbis superioribus, in quibus fit cæli terræ; mentio, intelligi non

much

" much more was this man to do it being com-
" pelled thereunto.

But where have the divine writers done this?

" Amongst many other Testimonies take *Mat.* " 12.18,19,20,21. where it is most manifest, that " only *v.* 19. belongeth to the purpose of " the Evangelist, when he would prove, why " Christ forbid, that he should be made known. " So *Act.* 7. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. where also *v.* " 17, 18. only doe make to the Apostles purpose, " which is to prove, that the Holy Ghost was " poured forth on the Disciples. And there also " *v.* 25, 26, 27, 28. where *v.* 27. only is to the " purpose: the Apostle proving only, that it was " impossible that Christ should be detained of " death. Lastly, in this very *Chap. v.* 9. where " these words, *thou hast loved Righteousnesse and ha-* " *ted iniquity*, are used; it is evident, that they be- " long not to the thing which the Apostle pro- " veth; which is, that Christ was made more ex- " cellent then the Angels.

potuerit, cum sit cum iis per vocem ipsi conjuncta, & eadem illa verba priora idem autor cõmemorare necesse habuit. Nam si alii scriptores sacri ad eum modum citant Testimonia Scripturæ, nulla adacti necessitate, multo magis huic necessitate compulso, id faciendum fuit.

Ubi vero Scriptores Sacri id fecerunt?

Inter alia multa testimonia, habes Mat. 12. v. 18, 19, 20, 21. *ubi nimis apertum est verficulum 19. tantum ad propositum Evangelistæ Matthæi pertinere, cum id voluerit probare, cur Christus, ne palam fieret, interdiceret. Deinde,* Act. 2. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. *Ubi etiam tantum* v. 17, & 18. *ad propositum Petri Apostoli faciunt, quod quidem est, ut Spiritum Sanctum esse effusum supra discipulos doceat: & ibidem* v. 25, 26, 27, 28. *Ubi palam est, versum tantum 27. ad propositum facere, quandoquidem id approbet Apostolus, Christum a morte detineri fuisse impossibile. Deniq; in hoc ipso capite,* v. 9. *ubi verba hæc,* dilexisti Justitiam & odio habuisti iniquitatem, *apparet nihil pertinere ad rem quam probat Apostolus, quæ est, Christum præstantiorem factum Angelis.*

§. 22. That in all this discourse there is not any thing considerable, but the horrible *boldnesse* of these men in *corrupting* and perverting the word of God, will easily to the plainest capacity be demonstrated; for which end, I offer the ensuing Animadversions.

§. 23. 1. To say these things are *not* spoken of Christ, because they are spoken of God, is a shameles *begging* of the thing in question; we prove Christ to be God, because these things are spoken of him, that are proper to God only.

§. 24. 2. It is one thing in generall that is spoken of, namely the *Deity of Christ*, which is proved by one Testimony from *Psal.* 102. concerning one *Property* of Christ, *viz.* his *Almigh-*

ty *Power*, manifested in the making *all things*, and disposing of them in his soveraigne will, himselfe abiding *unchangeable*.

3. It is *shamelesse impudence* in these *Gentlemen* to take upon them to say, that *this* part of the Apostles Testimony, which he produceth, is to his purpose, *that* not; as if they were wiser then the Holy Ghost, and knew *Pauls* designe better then himselfe. §. 25.

4. The foundation of their whole Evasion is most false, *viz.* that all the proofes of the excellency of Christ, above Angells, insisted on by the Apostle, belong peculiarly to what he is said to *receive by Inheritance*. The designe of the Apostle is, to prove the Excellency of Christ, in himselfe, and then in comparison of *Angels*; and therefore before the mention of what he received by Inheritance, he affirmes directly, that by him *God made the worlds*. And to this end it is most evident, that this Testimony, that he Created *Heaven and Earth*, is most directly subservient. §. 26

5. Christ also hath his *divine nature* by inheritance, that is, He was *Eternally begotten* of the *Essence* of his Father, and is thence by right of *Inheritance* his Sonne, as the Apostle proves from *Psal.* 2. 5. §. 27.

6. Our *Catechists* speake not according to their own Principles, when they make a difference between what Christ had *from himselfe*, and what he had from *Inheritance*: For they suppose he had nothing but by Divine *grant*, and voluntary concession, which they make the *Inheritance* here spoken of. Nor according to *ours*, who say not, that the Sonne, as the Sonne, *is a seipso*, or hath any thing *a seipso*; and so know not *what* they say. §. 28.

7. There is not then the least colour, or pretence, of denying this *first part* of the Testimony to belong to Christ. The whole is spoken of, to the *same purpose*, to the *same person*, belongs to the *same matter* in generall; and that first expression is, if not only, yet mainely, and chiefely effectuall to confirme the intendment of the Apostle; proving directly, that Christ is *better*, and more *excellent* then the *Angels*, in that he is *Jehovah*, that made Heaven and Earth; they are but his Creatures: As God often compares himselfe with others. In the *Psalmist* the words respect chiefely the making of Heaven and Earth, and these §. 29.

words are applyed to our Saviour. That the two workes of *making* and *abolishing* the world, should be assigned distinctly unto two Persons, there is no pretence to affirme. This boldnesse indeed is intollerable.

§. 30. 8. To *abolish* the world is no lesse a worke of Almighty Power, then to *make* it: nor can it be done by any but him that *made* it; and this confessedly is ascribed to Christ. And both alike belong to the asserting of the excellency of God above all crearures, which is here aymed to be done.

§. 31. 9. The Reason given why the first words, which are nothing to the purpose, are cited with the latter, is a miserable *begging* of the thing in question; Yea the first words are chiefely and eminently to the Apostles *purpose*, as hath been shewed. We dare not say *only*, for the Holy Ghost knew better then we, what was to his purpose, though our *Catechists* be wiser in their own conceits then He. Neither is there any Reason imaginable, why the Apostle should rehearse more words here out of the Psalme, then were directly to the businesse he had in hand; seeing how many Testimonies he cites, and some of them very briefely, leaving them to be supplyed from the places whence they are taken.

§. 32. 10. That others of the holy Writers doe urge Testimonies *not to their purpose, or beyond what they needed*, is *false* in it selfe, and a bold imputation of weakenesse to the Penmen of the Holy Ghost. The instances hereof given by our Adversaries, are not at all to to the purpose, which they are persuing. For

1. In no one of them is there a *Testimony* cited, whereof one part should concerne *one Person*, and another *another*, as is here pretended: and without farther processe this is sufficient to evince this evasion of impertinency: for nothing will amount to the interpretation they enforce on this place, but the producing of some place of the *New* Testament, where a Testimony is cited out of the *Old*, speaking throughout of the same Person, whereof the *one* part belongs to *him*, and the *other* not: although that, which they say *doth not belong to him*, be most *proper* for the confirmation of what is affirmed of him, and what the whole is brought in proofe of.

2. There is not any of the places instanced in by them, wherein the *whole* of the words is not directly to the purpose in

in hand, although some of them are more immediately suited to the occasion on which the whole Testimony is produced; as it were easy to manifest by the consideration of the severall places.

3. These words, *thou hast loved Righteousnesse, and hated Iniquity*, are not mentioned to prove immediately the Excellency of *Christ* above *Angels*, but his administration of his Kingdome, on which account he is so Excellent, among others; and thereunto they are most proper.

And this is the issue of their Attempt against this Testimony, which being thus briefely *vindicated*, is sufficient alone of it selfe to *consume with its brightnes* al the oposition, which from the *darkenesse* of Hell or Men, is made against the Deity of Christ. §. 33.

And yet we have *one* more to consider, before this text be dismissed. *Grotius* is nibling at this Testimony also. His words are: *Againe, that which is spoken of God he applyes to the Messiah: because it was confessed among the Hebrewes, that this world was created for the Messiahs sake, (whence I should think that* ἐθεμελίωσας *is rightly to be understood, thou wast the cause why it was founded; and the workes of thy hands, that is, it was made for thee) and that a new and better world should be made by him.* So he. §. 34.

Rursum, quod de Deo dictum fuerat Messiæ aptat: quia constabat inter Hæbræos, & mundum hunc Messiæ causa conditum, (unde ἐθεμελίωσας *recte intelligi putem, causa fuisti cur fundaretur; & opus manuum tuarum, id est propter te factum:* צד-יד *Hæbræis & Chaldeis etiam* propter *significat) & fore, ut novus mundus meliorq; condatur per ipsum.*

This is not the first time we have met with this conceite. And I wish that it had sufficed this *Learned man* to have framed his old Testament-Annotations, to *Rabinicall* Traditions, that the *New* might have escaped. But *jacta est alea.* I say then, that the Apostle doth not *apply* that to *one* Person, which was spoken of *another*; but asserts the words in the *Psalme* to be spoken of him, concerning whom he treates; and thence proves his Excellency, which is the businesse he hath in hand. It is not to *adorne* Christ with *Titles*, which were not due *to* him, (which to doe were *Robbery*) but to prove by *Testimonies* that were given *of* him, that he is no lesse then he affirmed him to be, even God blessed for ever. 2. Let any man in his right wits consider this Interpretation, and try whether he can perswade himselfe to receive it: ἐθεμελίωσας σὺ κύριε, *for thee O*

Lord were the foundations of the Earth laid: and the Heavens are the workes of thy hands, that is, *they were made for thee*. Any man may thus make *quidlibet ex quolibet*; but whether with due reverence to the word of God, I Question. 3. It is not about the sence of the *Hebrew particles* that we treat, (and yet the Learned man cannot give one cleare instance of what he affirmes) but of the designe of the Holy Ghost in the *Psalme*, and in this place of the *Hebrewes*, applying these words to Christ. 4. I marvell he saw not, that this interpretation doth most desperately *cut* its own throat, the parts of it being at an irreconcilable difference among themselves. For in the first place he saies, the words are spoken of *God*, and applyed to the *Messiah*, and then proves the sence of them to be such, as they cannot be spoken of *God* at all, but merely of the *Messiah*, for to that sence doth he labour to wrest both the *Hebrew*, and *Greeke* Text. Me thinks the Words being spoken of *God*, and not of the *Messiah*, but only fitted to him by the Apostle, there is no need to say that, *thou hast laid the foundations of the Earth*, is, that it was *laid for thy sake: and the Heavens are the workes of thy hands*, that is, they were *made for thee*: seeing they are properly spoken of God. This one *Rabinicall* figment, of the worlds being made for the *Messiah*, is the engine, whereby the *Learned man* turnes about, and perverts the sence of this whole Chapter. In briefe, if either the plaine sence of the words, or the intendment of the Holy Ghost in this place, be of any account, yea if the *Apostle* deales honestly, and sincerely, and speakes to what he doth propose, and urges that which is to his purpose, and doth not falsely apply that to Christ, which was never spoken of him, this *Learned Glosse* is directly contrary to the *Text*.

And these are the Testimonies given to the *Creation of all things* by Christ, which our *Catechists* thought good to produce to examination.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

All-ruling and disposing Providence assigned unto Christ, and his Eternall God-head thence farther confirmed, with other Testimonies thereof.

§. 1. THat Christ is *that God* who *made* all things, hath been proved by the undenyable Testimonies, in the last Chapter insisted on. That as the great and wise *Creatour* of all things, he doth also *governe, rule*, and *dispose* of the things by him created, is another evidence of his *Eternall power and God-head*; some Testimonies whereof, in that order of proceedure, which by our *Catechists* is allotted unto us, come now to be considered.

§. 2. The first they propose is taken from *Heb.* 1. 3. where the words spoken of Christ are, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, *upholding all things by the word of his power.*

He who *upholdeth all things by the word of his power*, is God; This is ascribed to God as his property: and by none, but by him who is God by nature, can it be performed. Now this is said expresly of Jesus Christ: who being *the brightnesse of his Fathers Glory, and expresse Image of his person, upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had himselfe purged our sinnes, &c.*

§. 3. This place, or the Testimony therein given to the divine Power of Jesus Christ, they seeke thus to elude.

"The word here *all things*, doth not, no more "then in many other places, signify all things uni- "versally without exception, but is referred to "those things only, which belong to the king- "dome of Christ: of which it may truly be "said, that the Lord Jesus beareth, that is, conser- "veth all things by the word of his Power. But "that the word [*all things*] is in this place referred "unto those things only, appeareth sufficiently "from the subject matter it selfe of it. Moreover "the word, which this writer useth, to *beare*, doth

Hic verbum, omnia, *non minus quam in pluribus aliis locis, non omnia in universum sine ulla exceptione designare; verum ad ea tantum, quæ ad Christi regnum pertineant, referri: de quibus vere dici potest, Dominum Jesum omnia verbo virtutis suæ portare, id est, conservare. Quod vero vox omnia, hoc loco ad ea duntaxat referatur, ex ipsa materia subjecta satis apparet. Præterea, verbum, quo hic uti-*

rather

"rather signify Governing and Administra-
"tion, then preservation, as these words
"annexed [*by the word of his power*] seeme to inti-
"mate.

aut scriptor, portare, magis gubernandi vel administrandi rationem quam conservandi significat, quemadmodum illa, quæ annexa sunt, verbo virtutis suæ, innuere videntur.

§. 4. This indeed is ejune, and almost unworthy of these men, if any things may be said so to be. For 1. why is τὰ πάντα here, the *things of the Kingdome of Christ?* It is the expresse description of the person of Christ, as the *brightnesse of his Fathers Glory, and the expresse Image of his person*, that the Apostle is treating of, and not at all of his Kingdome as Mediatour. 2. It expresly answers the worlds that he is said to make, *v.* 2. which are not the things of the Kingdome of Christ; nor doe our Catechists plead them directly so to be. This terme *all things*, is never put absolutely, for all the things of the Kingdome of Christ. 3. The *subject matter* here treated of by the Apostle, is the *Person of Jesus Christ*, and the eminency thereof. The *medium* whereby he proves it to be so excellent, is his Almighty power in creating and sustaining of *all things*. Nor is there any *subject matter* intimated, that should restraine these words to the things of the Kingdome of Christ. 4. The word φέρων, neither in its *native* signification, nor in the use of it in the Scripture, gives any countenance to the Interpretation of it, by *governing or administring*; nor can our Catechists give any one instance of that signification there. It is properly to *beare*, to *carry*, to *sustaine*, to *uphold*. Out of *nothing* Christ, made *all things*, and preserves them by his power from returning into nothing. 5. What insinuation of their sence they have from that expression, by the *word of his power*, I know not. By the *word of his power*, is by his *powerfull word*. And that that *Word* or command, is sometime taken for the effectuall strength and efficacy of Gods Dominion, put forth for the accomplishing of his own purposes, I suppose needs not much proving. *Grotius* would have the words δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, to referre to the *power of the Father*: *Christ upholdeth all things by the Word* of his Fathers Power; without Reason or proofe; nor will the *Grammaticall* Account beare that rendition of the *Relative* mentioned.

§. 5. About that which they urge out of *Jude* 15. I shall not contend. The Testimony from thence relyes on the Authority of

of the *vulgar latine translation*; which, as *to me*, may plead for it[s] selfe.

Neither of what is mentioned from 1 *Cor.* 10. shall I insist on any thing, but only the 9. *verse*, the words whereof are: *Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of Serpents.* The designe of the Apostle is known. From the example of Gods dealing with the *Children of Israel* in the Wilderness upon their sinne and provocations, there being a *parity* of state and condition between them and *Christians*, as to their spirituall participation of Jesus Christ, (*v.* 2, 3, 4.) he dehorts *Believers* from the wayes & sins, whereby God was *provoked* against them. Particularly in this *verse*, he insists on the *tempting of Christ*, for which the Lord *sent fiery Serpents* among them, by which they were destroyed: *Num.* 21. 6. He whom the people *tempted in the wilderness*, & for which they were destroyed by Serpents, was the Lord *Jehovah*: Now this doth the Apostle apply to Christ; He therefore is the *Lord Jehovah*. But they say §. 6. §. 7.

"From those words it cannot be proved, that "Christ was really tempted in the Wilderness: "as from the like speech if any one should so "speake may be apprehended; Be not refractory "to the Magistrates, as some of our Ancestors "were; you would not thence conclude straight-"way, that the same singular Magistrate were "in both places intended. And if the like phra-"ses of Speech are found in Scripture, in which "the like expression is referred to him, whose "name was expressed a little before, without "any repetition of the same name, it is there done "where another besides him who is expressed "cannot be understood: as you have an example "here of *Deut.* 6. 16. you shall not tempt the Lord "your God, as you tempted *him in Massah*. But in "this speech of the Apostle, of which we treat, "another besides Christ may be understood, "as *Moses* or *Aaron*; of which see *Numb.* 21. 5.

Ex iis verbis doceri non potest, Apostolum affirmare, Christum in deserto revera tentatum fuisse: ut è simili oratione, si quis ita diceret, deprehendi potest: ne sitis refractarii Magistratui, quemadmodum quidam majorum nostrorum fuerunt, non illico concluderes eundem numero magistratum utrobiq; designari. Quod si reperiantur in Scripturis ejusmodi loquendi modi, in quibus similis oratio ad eum, cujus nomen paulo ante expressum est, sine ulla illius ejusdem repetitione referatur, tum hoc ibi fit, ubi nullus alius præter eum, cujus expressum est nomen, subintelligi possit: ut exemplum ejus rei habes in illo testimonio, Deut. 6. 16. *non tentabis Dominum Deum tuum, quemadmodum tentasti in loco tentationis. Verum in ea oratione Apostoli, de qua agimus, potest subintelligi alius præter Christum, ut* Moses, Aaron, &c. *de quo vide,* Num. 21. 5.

But

§. 8. 1. Is there the same reason of these two expressions, *doe not tempt Christ as some of them tempted*, and *be not refractory against the Magistrate, as some of them were? Christ* is the name of one singular individuall Person, wherein none shareth at any time, it being proper only to him. *Magistrate* is a terme of office, as it was to him that went *before* him, and will be to him that shall follow *after* him.

§. 9. 2. They need not to have puzled their *Catechumens* with their long Rule, which I shall as little need to examine: for none can be understood here but Christ. That the word, *God*, should be here understood, they doe not plead; nor if they had a mind thereunto, is there any place for that plea. For if the Apostle had intended *God*, in distinction from *Christ*, it was of absolute necessity that He should have expressed it. Nor if it had been expressed, would the Apostles Argument been of any force, unlesse *Christ* had been God, equall to him, who was so tempted.

§. 10. 3. It is *false*, that the Israelites *tempted Moses*, *or Aaron*, or that it can be said they tempted them: it is God they are every where said to *tempt*, *Psal.* 78. 18, 24. *Psal.* 106. 14. *Heb.* 3. 9. It is said indeed, that they *murmured against Moses*, that they *provoked* him, that they *chode* with him; but to *tempt* him, which is to require a signe, and manifestation of his *Divine Power*, that they did not, nor could be said to doe, *Numb.* 21. 3.

§. 11. *Grotius* tryes his last shift in this place, and tells us, from I know not what *ancient manuscript*, that it is not, let us not tempt *Christ*, but let us not tempt *God*. *Error commissus ex notis* Θν & Χν. That neither the *Syriack*, nor the *Vulgar Latine* translations, nor any copy, that either *Stephanus*, in his edition of the New Testament, or in his *various lections*, had seen, nor any of *Beza's*, nor *Erasmus* his, who would have been ready enough to have layd hold of the Advantage, should in the least give occasion of any such conjecture of an Alteration, doth wholy take off with me all the Authority, either of the *manuscript*, or of him that affirmes it from thence.

§. 12. As they please to procced, the next place to be considered is, John 12. 41. *these things said Esaias, when he saw his Glory, and spake of him.*

The words in the foregoing verses, repeated by the Apostle, manifest

manifest, that it is the *vision* mentioned *Isa.* 6. that the Apostle relates unto: whence we thus argue: *He whose Glory Isaiah saw*, Chap. 6. *was the Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Hosts* v. 3. *the King, the Lord of Hosts*, v. 5. But this was *Jesus Christ, whose Glory Isaiah* then saw, as the Holy Ghost witnesses in these words of *Joh.* 12. 41. What say our Catechists.

§. 13.

"First it appeares that these words are not "necessarily referred to Christ, because they may "be understood of God the Father. For the "words a little before are spoken of him, He hath "blinded, hardned, healed. Then the Glory "that Isaiah saw might be, nay was not present "but future: for it is proper to Prophets to see "things future, whence they are called Seers: "1 *Sam.* 9. 9. Lastly although these words should "be understood of that Glory which was then "present and seen to Isaiah, yet to see the Glory "of one and to see himselfe are farre different "things. And in the Glory of that one God, "Isaiah saw also the Glory of the Lord Christ. "For the Prophet sayes there, the whole Earth is "full of the Glory of God v. 3. But then was this "accomplished in reallity, when Jesus appeared "to that People, and was afterwards preached "to the whole world.

Primum, ea verba ad Christum non necessario referri hinc apparet, quod de Deo Patre accipi possint: etenim verba paulo superiora de eodem dicuntur. Excaecavit, induravit, sanavit. Deinde, gloriam, quam Esaias vidit potuisse esse, imo erat, non praesens, sed futura. Etenim proprium est vatibus futura videre, unde etiam, videntes appellati fuere, 1 Sam. 9. 9. Deniq; etiamsi de gloria ea quae tum praesens erat Esaiae visa haec verba accipias, long e tamen aliud est, gloriam alicujus videre, & aliud ipsummet videre. Et in gloria illius unius Dei vidit etiam Esaias Gloriam Christi Domini. Ait enim ibidem vates, plena est terra gloria Dei, Esa. 6. 3. Tum autem hoc reipsa factum est, cum Jesus Christus illi populo primum apparuit, & post toti mundo annunciatus est.

It is most evident, that these men know not *what* to say, nor what to stick to, in their interpretation of this place. This makes them heap up so many severall suggestions, contradictory one to another, crying, that it *may be thus*, or it *may be thus*. But 1. That these words cannot be referred to God the Father, but must of necessity be referred to Christ, is evident, because there is no occasion of mentioning him in this place, but an account is given of what was spoken v. 37. *But though he had done so many miracles before them yet they believed not on him*: to which answers this verse, *when he saw HIS Glory, and spake of HIM.* The other words of *blinding* and *hardning*, are evidently alleadged, to give an account of the Reason of the Jewes obstinacy in their

§. 14.

unbeliefe, not relating immediately to the person spoken of. The subject matter treated of, is Christ. The occasion of mentioning this Testimony, is Christ. Of him here are the words spoken. 2. The *Glory Isaiah saw was present*; all the *circumstances* of the vision evince no lesse. He tells you the *time*, *place*, and *circumstances* of it, *when* he *saw* the *Seraphims*, when he heard their *voice*; when the *doore* moved at the voice of him that cryed, when the *house* was filled with Glory, and when he himselfe was so terrifyed, that he cryed out, *wo is me, for I am undone.* If any thing in the world be certaine, it is certaine, that he *saw that Glory present.* 3. He did not only *see his Glory*, but he *saw him*: or he so saw his Glory, as that he *saw him*, so as he may be seen; So the Prophet sayes expressly: *I have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts*: And what the Prophet sayes of seeing the Lord of Hosts, the Apostle expresses by seeing his Glory, because he saw him in that glorious vision, or saw that glorious representation of his presence. 4. He did indeed see the Glory of the Lord Christ, in *seeing the Glory of the one God*, He being the true God of *Israel*, and on no other account is his Glory seen, then by seeing the Glory of the one true God. 5. The Prophet doth not say, that the *Earth was full of the glory of God*, but it is the Proclamation, that the *Seraphims* made one to another, concerning *that* God, whose presence was then there manifested. 6. When Christ first appeared to the People of the *Jewes*, there was no great manifestation of Glory. The Earth was alwaies full of the Glory of God. And if those words have any peculiar relation to the Glory of the Gospell, yet withall they prove, that He was then present, whose *Glory in the Gospell* was afterwards to fill the Earth.

§. 15. *Grotius* hath not ought to adde, to what was before insisted on by his Friends. *A representation he would have this be of Gods dealing in the Gospell*: (when it is, plainely, his proceeding in the rejection of the Jewes for their incredulity) and tells you, *dicitur Isaiah vidisse Gloriam Christi, sicut Abrahamus Diem ejus*: *Isaiah saw his Glory, as Abraham saw his day.* Well aimed however: *Abraham saw his day* by *Faith*, *Isaiah* saw his *Glory* in a vision; *Abraham* saw his day as *Future*, and rejoyced: *Isaiah* so saw his *Glory*, as God *Present*, that he trembled: *Abraham* saw the day of Christ, all the dayes of his believing, *Isaiah* saw his *Glory* only

only in the yeere that *King Uzziah* dyed: *Abraham saw* the day of Christ in the *promise* of his coming, *Isaiah* saw his Glory with the *circumstances* before mentioned. Even such let all undertakings appeare to be, that are against the Eternall Deity of Jesus Christ.

In his Annotations on the 6. of *Isaiah*, where the *vision* insisted on is expressed, He takes no notice at all of Jesus Christ, or the second Person of the *Trinity*. Nor (which is very strange) doth he so much as once intimate, that what is here spoken, is applyed by the Holy Ghost unto Christ in the Gospell; Nor once names the Chapter where it is done. With what *mind*, and intention the businesse is thus carried, *God knowes, I know not.*

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Incarnation of Christ, and his preexistence thereunto.

§. 1. THe Testimonies of Scripture, which affirme Christ to have been *Incarnate*, or to have taken *flesh*, which inevitably proves his *Preexistence*, in another nature, to his so doing, they labour in their next attempt to corrupt, and so to evade the force, and efficacy, which from them appeareth so destructive to their cause; and herein they thus proceed.

§. 2. *From what Testimonies of Scripture do they endeavour to demonstrate, that Christ was (as they speake) incarnate.*

E quibus Testimoniis Scriptura demonstrare conantur, Christum (ut loquuntur) incarnatum esse?

From these, Joh. 1. 14. Phil. 2. 6, 7. 1 Tim. 3. 16. Heb. 2. 16. 1 Joh. 4, 2, 3. Heb. 10. 11.

Ex iis, ubi secundum eorum versionem legitur, verbum caro factum est, Joan. 1. 14. *Et qui (Christus) cum esset in forma Dei &c.* Phil. 2. 6, 7. 1 Tim. 3. 16. Heb. 2. 16. Joan. 4. 2, 3. Heb. 10. 11.

§. 3. Of the first of these we have dealt already, in the handling of the beginning of that Chapter, and sufficiently vindicated it

from all their exceptions; so that we may proceed immediately to the second.

§. 4.

Ad secundum quid respondes?

Neq; hic exstare, quod adversa pars confectum velit. Aliud enim est, quod hic Apostolus ait, cum in forma Dei esset, formam servi assumpsit; aliud vero, natura divina assumpsit humanam. Etenim hic forma Dei designare non potest Dei naturam, cum Apostolus scribat, eam formam Christum exinaniviisse. Deus vero naturam suam nullo modo exinanire potest. Nec vero forma servi denotat naturam humanam, cum servum esse ad fortunam & conditionem hominis referatur. At ne id quoq; dissimulandum est, scripta Novi Testamenuti hanc vocem, forma, semel fortassis tantũ alibi usurpare, Mar. 16.12. *idq; eo sensu, quo non naturam, sed exteriorem speciem significat, cum ait, Jesum duobis discipulis suis apparuisse in alia forma.*

Ex iis vero verbis, quæ Apostolus paulo post subjecit, habitu inventus est ut homo, nonne apparet eum (ut loquuntur) incarnatum esse?

Nullo modo, etenim ea oratio nihil in se habet ejusmodi. De Sampsone enim in literis sacris legimus, quod idem futurus erat, ut homo; Judic. 16.7,11. *&* Psal. 82. *Asaph iis hominibus, quos Deos & Filios altissimi vocaverat, denunciat, quod essent morituri ut homines; de quibus certum est, non posse dici, eos (ut adversarii dicant) incarnatos fuisse.*

What doest thou answer to the second?

"Neither is that here contained, which the "adverse party would prove; for it is one thing "which the Apostle saith, being in the forme of "God he tooke the forme of a servant: another, "that the Divine nature assumed the humane. For "the forme of God cannot here denote the di-"vine Nature, seeing the Apostle writes, that "Christ *exinanivit*, made that forme of no repu-"tation. But God can no way make his nature "of no reputation. Neither doth the forme of "a servant, denote Humane Nature, seeing to be "a servant is referred to the fortune and conditi-"on of a man. Neither is that also to be for-"gotten, that the writings of the New Testa-"ment doe once only (it may be) use that word "*forme* elsewhere, *viz. Mark* 16.12 and that in "that sence, wherein it signifyes, not nature, but "the outward appearance, saying, Jesus appea-"red in another forme, unto two of his Disci-"ples.

But from those words, which the Apostle afterwards adds, he was found in fashion as a man, doth it not appeare, that He was as they say Incarnate?

"By no meanes; For that expression con-"taines nothing of Christs Nature: for of *Samp-"son* we read that he should be as a man: *Judg.* "16.7,11. and *Psal.* 82. *Asaph* denounceth to those "whom he called Sonnes of the most High, that "they should dye like men. Of whom it is "certaine, that it cannot be said of them, that "they were (as they speake) Incarnate.

How

§. 5.

How doest thou understand this place?

"On this manner, that Christ, who in the "world, like God, did the workes of God, to "whom all yeilded Obedience, as to God, and "to whom divine adoration was given, God so "willing, and the Salvation of men requiring it, "was made as a servant, and a vassall, and as one "of the vulgar, when he had of his own accord "permitted himselfe to be taken, bound, beaten, "and slaine. Thus they.

Qua ratione locum hunc totum intelligis?

Ad eum modum, quod Christus, qui in mundo instar dei, opera dei efficiebat, & cui sicut deo omnia parebāt & cui divina adoratio exhibebatur, ita volente deo, & hominum salute exigente, factus est tanquam servus, & mancipium, & tanquam unus ex aliis vulgaribus hominibus cum ultro sē capi, vinciri, cædi, & occidi permiserat.

§. 6.

Now becaus̄e it is most certaine, and evident to every one, that ever considered this text, that according to their old trade and craft, they have mangled it, and taken it in pieces, at least cut off the *head* and *leggs* of this Witnesse, we must seeke out the other parts of it, and lay it together, before we may proceed to remove this heape out of our way. Our Argument from this place, is not solely from hence, that he is said to be in the *forme of God*; but also that he was *so in the forme of God*, as to be *equall* to him, as is here expressed; nor meerely that he took upon him the *forme of a servant*, but that he tooke it upon him, when He was *made in the likenes of man*, or in the *likenes of sinfull flesh*, as the Apostle expresses it *Ro.8.3*. Now these things our *Catechists* thought good to take no notice of, in this place, nor of one of them any more in any other. But seeing the very head of our Argument lyes in this, that in the *forme of God*, he is said to be *equall* to God, and that expression is in another place taken notice of by them, I must needs gather it into its own *contexture* before I doe proceed. Thus then they

§. 7.

How doest thou Answer to those places, where Christ is said to be equall to God, Joh. 5.18. Phil.2.6.

Qui porro ad ea loca respondes?

Quod Christus sit æqualis deo, id divinam in eo naturam nullo modo probat, imo hinc res adversa colligitur. Nam si Christus deo, qui natura deus est, æqualis est, efficitur, quod is idem deus esse non possit. Æqualitas vero christi cum

"That Christ is equall to God, doth no way "prove, that there is in him a divine Nature. "Yea the contrary is gathered from hence. For if "Christ be equall to God, who is God by nature, "it followes, that He cannot be the same God. "But the equality of Christ with God lyes here-

Deo in eo est, quod ea virtute, quam in eum contulit deus, ea omnia efficeret, & efficiat, quæ ipsius dei sunt, tanquam deus ipse.

"in that by that virtue, that God bestowed on "him, he did, and doth all those things, which are "Gods, as God himselfe.

§. 8. This being the whole of what they tender, to extricate themselves from the *Chaines*, which this witnes casts upon them, now lying before us, I shall propose our *Argument* from the words, and proceed to the vindication of it in order.

§. 9. The intendment and designe of the Apostle in this place, being evidently to exhort Believers to *selfedenyall*, *mutuall love*, and *condescention* one to another, he proposes to them the example of Jesus Christ: and lets them know, that he being in the *forme of God*, and *equall to God* therein; (ὑπάρχων, *existing* in that forme, having both the *nature*, and *Glory* of God,) did yet in his love to us, *make himselfe of no reputation*, or lay aside, and *eclipse* his Glory, in this, that he tooke upon him the *forme of a servant*, being *made man*, that in that forme, and nature, He might be obedient unto death, for us, and in our behalfe: Hence we thus plead.

§. 10. He that was in the *forme of God, and equall to God, existing therein, and tooke on him the nature, and forme of a servant, He is God by nature, and was Incarnate, or made flesh, in the sence before spoken of: Now all this is affirmed of Jesus Christ*: Ergo.

§. 11. 1. To this they say, (that we may consider that first, which is first in the Text) that his being *equall* to God, doth not prove him to be *God* by nature: but the contrary, &c. as above. But 1. if none is, nor can, by the Testimony of God himselfe, be *like* God, or *equal* to him, who is not God by nature; then he that is *equall to him*, is so: but, *to whom will ye liken me, or shall I be equall, saith the Holy one, lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things*, Isa. 40. 25. none, that hath not created *all things* of no thing, can be equall to him: *And to whom will ye liken me, and make me equall, and compare me, that we may be like*, Chap. 46. 5. (2.) Between that which is *finite* and that which is *infinite*, that which is *eternall*, and that which is *temporall*, the *Creature* and the *Creator*, *God by nature*, and him, who by *nature is not God*, It is utterly impossible there should be any *Equality*. 3. God having so often avouched his *infinite* distance from all *Creatures*, his refusall to give his glory to any of them, his *inequality*

quality with them all, it must have been the highest *Robbery*, that ever any could be guilty of, for Christ to make himselfe *equall to God*, if he were not God. 4. The Apostles Argument arises from hence, that he was *equall* to God, before he tooke on him the forme of a *Servant*, which was before his working of those mighty workes, wherein these *Gentlemen* assert him to be *equall* to God.

§. 12. 2. Themselves cannot but know the ridiculousnesse of their *begging* the thing in question, when they would argue, that because *He was equall to God*, He was *not* God: He was the same *God in nature, and Essence*, and therein *equall* to him, to whom he was in subordination, as the *Sonne*; and in *Office* a *Servant*, as undertaking the worke of Mediation.

§. 13. 3. The case being as by them stated, there was no *equality* between Christ and God, in the *workes he wrought*: For 1. God doth the workes in his own *Name*, and *Authority*, Christ in Gods. 2. God doth them by his *own Power*, Christ by Gods. 3. God doth them *himselfe*, Christ not, but God in him, as another from him. 4. He doth not do them *as* God, however that expression be taken; for according to these men, He wrought them, neither in his *own name*, nor by his *own power*, nor for his *own glory*, all which he must doe, who doth things, *as* God.

§. 14. 2. He is said to be *equall to God*, not as He did such, and such workes, but as, ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, being *in the forme of God*; antecedently to the taking in hand of that *forme*, wherein He wrought the workes intimated.

§. 15. 3. To worke *great workes*, by the power of God, argues no *Equality* with him; or else all the Prophets, and Apostles, that wrought *miracles*, were also equall to God. The *infinite inequality* of nature, between the Creatour and the most Glorious Creature, will not allow, that it be said on any account to be equall to him. Nor is it said, that Christ was equall to God, in *respect of the workes He* did, but *Absolutely*, *He thought it no Robbery to be equall to God*. And so is their *last* plea to the *first* part of our *Argument* accounted for: come we to what they begin withall.

§. 16. 1. We contend not (as hath been often said) about *words* and *expressions*. That the *Divine nature assumed the Humane*, we thus

thus farre abide by, That the *Word*, the *Sonne* of God, tooke to himselfe, into Personall subsistence with him, an *humane nature*, whence they are both one Person, one Christ: and this is here punctually affirmed, *viz.* *He* that *was*, and *is* God, tooke upon him the *forme of a man*. 2. The Apostle doth not say, that Christ made that forme of no Reputation, or Christ ἐκένωσε that *forme*, but Christ being in that forme ἐκένωσε ἑαυτὸν, *made himselfe of no reputation*; not by any *reall* change of his *Divine* nature, but taking to himselfe the *Humane*, wherein he was of *no reputation*. It being he that was so, in the *nature* & by the *dispensation*, *wherein* he was so; and it being not possible, that the *Divine nature* of it selfe, in it selfe, should be humbled, yet *He* was *humbled*, who was in the forme of God, though the *forme* of God was not.

§. 17. 3. It is from his being *equall* with God, in the *forme* of God, whereby we prove, that his being in the *forme* of God doth denote his divine Nature: but of this our *Catechists* had no minde to take notice.

§. 18. 2. The *forme of a servant*, is that which he tooke, when he was made ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων; as *Adam* begat a Sonne in his own *likenesse*. Now this was not only in *condition a servant*, but in *reallity*, *a man*. 2. The *forme of a servant* was that wherein he underwent death, the death of the Crosse; but he dyed as a *man*, and not only in the appearance of a Servant. 3. The very phrase of *expression* manifests the humane nature of Christ to be denoted hereby: only as the Apostle had not before said directly that he *was God*, but in the *forme of God*, expressing both his nature, and his Glory, so here he doth not say *He was a man*, *but in the forme of a Servant*, expressing both his *nature and his condition*, wherein he was the servant of the Father. Of him it is said ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, but μορφὴν δούλου λαβών: He *was* in the *other*, but *this* He *tooke*. 4. To be a *servant* denotes the state or condition of a man: but for *one* who was in the *forme of God and equall to him*, to be made in the *forme of a servant*, and to be *found as a man*, and to be in that *forme put to death*, denotes in the first place, a taking of that *nature*, wherein alone he could be a servant. And this Answers also to other expressions, of the *Word being made flesh*, and God *sending forth his own Sonne made of a woman*. 5. This is manifest from the expression, ἐν σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος; He *was found in fashion as a man*: that is, He was

was truely so; which *is exegeticall* of what was spoken before *He took on him the forme of a servant.*

But they say this is of no importance; *For the same is said of Sampson,* Judg.16.7,11. *and of others* Psal.82. *who yet we doe not say were incarnate.* §. 19.

These *Gentlemen* are still like themselves. Of Christ it is said, that he *humbled* himselfe, and tooke upon him the forme of a *Servant,* and was found in likenesse as a *man*: of *Sampson*, that being stronger then an *hundred men,* if he were dealt so and so withall, he would *become as other men,* for so the words expresly are: no stronger then another man; and these places are *paralell*: much good may these *paralells* doe your *Catechumens.* And so of those in the *Psalme,* that though in this world they are *high in power* for a season, yet they should dy as other *men* do. Hence, in a way of triumph and merriment, they aske, if these were *incarnate*, and answer themselves, that surely we will not say so. True, he who being as *strong* as many becomes by any meanes to be as *one,* and they who *live* in power, but *dye* in weakenesse, as other men doe, are not said to be incarnate: but He who *being God, tooke on him the forme of a Servant, and was in this world a very man,* may (by our new Masters leave,) be said to be so.

For the sence which they give us of this place, (for they are *bold* to venture at it) it hath been in part spoken to already. Christ was in the world, as to outward appearance, no way *instar Dei,* but rather as he sayes of himselfe, *instar vermis.* That he did the *workes of God,* and was worshiped as God, was because *He was God;* nor could any but God, either doe the one, *as* He did them, or admit of the other. 2. This is the exposition given us; *Christ was in the forme of God, counting it no robbery to be equall to him, that is, whilst he was here in the world in the forme of a servant, He did the workes of God and was worshiped.* 3. Christ was in the forme of a *Servant* from his first coming into the world, & as *one of the people*; Therefore He was not *made* so by any thing afterwards: his being *bound, and beate, and killed,* is not his being made a servant; for that by the Apostle is afterwards expressed, when he tells us *why,* or for *what end,* not *how,* or *wherein* He was made a Servant; *viz.* He became obedient to death, the death of the Crosse. §. 20.

§. 21. And this may suffice for the taking out of our way, all that is excepted against this testimony by our *Catechists*: but because the Text is of great importance, and of it selfe sufficient to evince the Sacred truth we plead for, some farther observations, for the illustration of it, may be added.

§. 22. The sence they intend to give us of these words is plainely this: that *Christ by doing miracles in the world, appeared to be as God, or as a God: but he laid aside this forme of God, and tooke upon him the forme of a servant, when He suffered himself to be taken, bound, & crucified: He began to be*, they say, *in the forme of God, when after his baptisme, He undertooke the worke of his publike Ministry, and wrought mighty workes in the world*: which forme he ceased to be in, when he was taken in the Garden, and exposed *as a servant* to all manner of reproach.

§. 23. That there is not any thing in this whole exposition, Answering the minde of the Holy Ghost, is evident as from what was said before; so also 1. Because it is said of Christ, that ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, *He was in the forme of God*, before he tooke the *forme of a servant*, and yet the taking of the *forme of a servant* in this place, doth evidently answer his *being made flesh*, Joh. 1. 14. his being made in the *likenesse of sinfull flesh*, Rom 8.3. his *comeing* or being *sent* into the world, Math. 10.11. 20.28. Joh. 3, 16, 17. &c. 2. Christ was still in the *forme* of God, as taken *essentially*, even then, when he was a servant, though as to the dispensation He had submitted to, He *emptied* himselfe of the Glory of it, and was not knowne to be the Lord of Glory, 2 *Cor.* 8. 3. Even all the while that they say He was in the *forme of God*, He was in the *forme of a servant*, that is, *He was really the servant of the Father*, and was dealt withall in the world *as a servant*, under all manner of *reproach, revilings*, and persecutions. He was no more in the forme of a servant when he was *bound*, then when he had not *where to lay his head*. 4. The state and condition of a *Servant* consists in this, that he is not *sui juris*: no more was Christ in the whole course of his Obedience; he did not any *private will* of his own, but the *will of him that sent him*. Those who desire to see the vindication of this place to the utmost, in all the particulars of it, may consult the confutation of the interpretation of *Erasmus*, by *Beza*, Annot. in Phil. 2. 6, 7. Of *Ochinus*, and *Lælius Socinus*, by *Zanchius in locum*; & *de Tribus Elohim*.

Elohim, pag. 227. &c. Of *Faustus Socinus*, by *Beckman*: *exercitat*: pag. 168. & *Johan. Jun. Examen Respon. Socin.* pag. 201, 202. Of *Enjedinus*, by *Comarus*, *Anal. Epist. Paul. ad Philip.* cap. 2. Of *Osiorcdus*, by *Jacobus a porta*, *Fidei Orthodox. Defens.* pag. 89. 150. &c. That which I shall farther adde, is in reference to *Grotius*, whose Annotations may be one day considered by some of more *Time* and leasure for so necessary a worke.

Thus then he: ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων] Μορφὴ *in nostris libris non significat internum & occultum aliquid, sed id quod in oculos incurrit, qualis erat eximia in Christo potestas sanandi morbos omnes, ejiciendi Dæmones, excitandi mortuos, mutandi rerum naturas: quæ verè Divina sunt, ita ut Moses, qui tam magna non fecit, dictus ob id fuit Deus Pharaonis: vocem μορφῆς quo dixi sensu habes* Mar. 16. 12. Isa. 44. 13. *ubi in Hebræo* תכנית; Dan. 4. 33. 6. 19. 6. 28. *ubi in Chaldæo* זיו: Job. 4. 16. *ubi in Hebræo* תמונה. "Μορφὴ in our "Books doth not signify an internall, or hidden thing, but "that which is visibly discerned: such as was that eminent "power in Christ of healing all Diseases, casting out Divels, "raising the Dead, changing the Natures of things: which "are truly Divine; so that *Moses*, who did not so great things, "was therefore called the God of *Pharaoh*: The word μορφὴ, in "the sence spoken of, you have, *Mar.* 16. 12. *Isa.* 44. 13. where in "the Hebrew it is תכנית *Dan.* 4. 33. &c. where in the Chal. "dee it is זיו: *Job.* 14 6. where in the Hebrew it is תמונה. §. 24.

An. A *Forme* is either *substantiall*, or *accidentall*: that which *is* indeed, or that which *appears*. That it is the *substantiall* forme of God, which is here intended, yet with respect to the glorious manifestation of it, (which may be also as the accidentall forme) hath been formerly declared, and proved. So farre it signifies that which is *internall and hidden*, or not visibly discerned, in as much as the *Essence* of God is invisible. The proofes of this I shall not now repeat. 2. Christs *power of working miracles* was not *visible*, though the miracles He wrought were *visible*; insomuch, that it was the great Question between him, and the Jewes, by what power He wrought his Miracles; for they still pleaded, that he cast out Divells by *Beelzebub*, the Prince of the Divels. So that if the power of doing the things mentioned, were μορφὴ Θεοῦ, that *forme was not visible*, and exposed to the sight of men, for it was *aliquid internum & occultum*, a thing §. 25.

internall and hidden. 3. If to be in the *forme of God*, and thereupon to be *equall to him*, be to have *power*, or *Authority*, of *healing diseases*, casting out Divels, raising the dead, and the like; then the *Apostles* were in the *forme* of God, and *equall* to God, having power and Authority given them for all these things, which they wought accordingly; *casting out Divels, healing the diseased, raising the dead, &c.* which whether it be not *blasphemy* to affirme, the reader may judge. 4. It is true, God sayes of *Moses*, Exod. 7.1. *I have made thee a God to Pharaoh*; which is expounded c.4.16. where God tels him, that *Aaron* should be to him *insteed* of a *mouth*, & he should be to him *insteed of God*. That is, *Aaron* should speak & deliver to *Pharaoh*, & the *people*, what God *revealed* to *Moses*, *Moses* revealing it to *Aaron*; *Aaron* receiving his message from *Moses*, as other Prophets did from God, whence he is said to be to him insteed of God: And this is given as the reason of that expression, c.7.1. of his being a God to *Pharaoh*; even as our Saviour speakes, because the *word of God came by him*; because he should reveale the will of God to him. *Thou shalt be a God to Praraoh, and Aaron thy Brother shall be thy Prophet; Thou shalt speake all that I command thee, and Aaron thy Brother shall speake to Pharaoh.* He is not upon the account of his *working miracles* called God, or said to be in the *forme of God*, or to be made *equall* to God; but revealing the will of God to *Aaron*, who spake it to *Pharaoh*, he is said to be a *God to Pharaoh*, or in the *stead of* God, as to that businesse. 5. It is true, the word μορφὴ, or forme, is used *Mar.* 16.12. for the outward *appearance*; and it is as true the *verbe* of the same signification is used for the *internall and invisible forme of a thing*, Gal. 4.19. ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, untill Christ be *formed* in you. So that the very first observation of our *Annotatour*, that in our *bookes*, that is, the *Scriptures*, (for in other Authors it is acknowledged, that this word signifyes the internall forme of a thing) this word μορφὴ signifies not any thing *internall or hidden*, is true only of that one place, *Mar.* 16.12. in *this* it is otherwise, & the *verbe* of the same signification is evidently otherwise used. And which may be added, other words, that bare the same Ambiguity of signifycation, as to things substantiall or accidentall, being applyed to Christ, doe still signify the former, not the latter; yea where they expressly Answer what is here spoken; as εἰκὼν, *Col.* 1.15. & ὑπόστασις *Heb.* 1.3. both of the same import with μορφὴ here, save that the latter adds *personality*.

6

6. For the words mentioned out of the *Old Testament*, they are used in businesses quite of another nature, and are restrained in their significations by the matter they speake of. תכנית, is not μορφὴ properly, but εἰκὼν, and is translated *imago*, by *Arias Mon*: תאר, is rather μορφὴ, *Gen.*29.17. 1 *Sam.*28.14. תמונה is used ten times in the *Bible*, and hath various significations, and is variously rendred: ὁμοίωμα, *Deut.*4.15. γλυπτὸν ὁμοίωμα, v.16. so most commonly. זיו in *Daniel* is *splendor*, δόξα, not μορφὴ: and what all this is to our purpose in hand, I know not. The *forme of God*, wherein Christ was, is that, wherein He *was equall to God*: that, which as to the Divine Nature, is the same, as his being in the forme of a Servant, wherein He was *obedient to death*, was to the humane. And which is sufficiently destructive of this whole Exposition, Christ was then *in the forme of a Servant*, when this Learned man would have him to be in the *forme of God*, which two are opposed in this place; for he was the servant of the Father in the whole course of the work, which He wrought here below: *Isa.*42.1.

He proceeds on this foundation: οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ.] Ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγῆσθαι, *est locutio Syriaca: in Liturgiâ Syriacâ, Johannes Baptista Christo Baptismum ab ipso expetenti, dicit, non assumam rapinam. Solent qui aliquid bellicâ virtute peperere, id omnibus ostentare, ut Romani in Triumpho sane solebant. Non multum aliter Plutarchus in Timoleon*: οὐχ ἁρπαγλῷ ἡγήσατο. *Sensus est, non venditavit Christus, non jactavit istam potestatem: quia sæpe etiam imperavit ne quod fecerat vulgaretur.* Ἴσα *hic est adverbium; sic Odyss: O*: Τὸν νῦν ἴσα θεῷ &c. Ἰσόθεα σεύειν, *dixit Scriptor*, 2 Macc. 9. 12. εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, *est spectari tanquam Deum.* The summe of all is; *He thought it no Robbery*, that is, *He boasted not of his power, to be equall to God, so to be looked on as a God.* §.26.

The words I confesse are not without their difficulty: many Interpretations are given of them; and I may say, that of the very many which I have considered, this of all others, as being wrested to countenance a false *hypothesis*, is the worst. To insist particularly on the opening of the words, is not my present *task*. That *Grotius* is besides the sence of them, may be easily manifested; for 1. He brings nothing to enforce this interpretation; That the expression is *Syriack*, in the *idiome* of it, he abides not by: giving us an instance of the same phrase of expression out of §.27.

of *Plutarch*; who knew the propriety of the *Greeke* tongue very well, and of the *Syriack* not at all. Others also give a paralell expression out of *Thucidides*, *lib.* 8. οὐδὲν ἀρπαγὴν ποιησάμενος. 2. I grant ἴσα may be used adverbially; and be rendered *æqualiter*: but now the words are to be interpreted *pro subjecta materia*. He who was in the *forme of God*, counted it no Robbery; (that is, did not *esteeme it to be any wrong*, on that account of his being in the forme of God,) to be *equall* to his Father, did yet so submit himselfe, as is described. This being *equall to God*, is spoken of Christ *accidentally* to his taking on him the *forme of a Servant*, which He did in his *Incarnation*, and must relate to his being in the *forme of God*; and if thereunto it be added, that the intendment reaches to the declaration he made of himselfe, when he declared himselfe to be equall to God the Father, and one with him, as to Nature and Essence, it may compleat the sence of this *place*.

§. 28. Ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε: He renders, *libenter duxit vitam inopem*; referring it to the poverty of Christ, whilest he conversed here in the world. But what ever be intended by this expression, it is not the same with μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, which *Grotius* afterwards interprets to the same purpose with what he saies here of these words. 2. It must be something antecedent to his *taking the forme of a servant*, or rather something that he did, or became, exceptively to what he was before, in *becoming a servant*. He was in the forme of God, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, but He *humbled*, or *bowed down* himselfe, in taking the forme of a servant: that is, *He condescended thereunto*, in his great love that He bare to us, The demonstration whereof the Apostle insists expressly upon; and what greater demonstration of love, or condescention upon the account of love could possibly be given, then for him who was *God*, *equall to his Father*, in the *same* Deity, to lay aside the manifestation of his glory, & to take upon him our nature, therein to be a servant unto death.

§. 29. He proceeds μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, *similis factus servis, qui nihil proprium possident*: *He was made like unto servants, who possesse nothing of their own*. Our Catechists, with their great Master, referre this his *being like servants*, *to the usage He submitted to at his death*; this *man* to his *poverty* in his life. And to this sence of these words is that place of *Math.* 8. 20. better accommodated, then to the clause

clause foregoing, for whose Exposition it is produced by our *Annotatour*.

But 1. It is most certaine, that the exposition of *Grotius* will not, being laid together, be at any tollerable agreement with it selfe, if we allow any order of processe to be in these words of the Apostle: His aime is acknowledged to be an Exhortation to *Brotherly love, and mutuall condescention* in the same, from the Example of Jesus Christ; for he tells you, that *He being in the forme of God, made himselfe of no reputation, and tooke upon him the forme of a servant.* Now if this be not the graduation of the Apostle, that in being in the *forme* of God, free from any thing of that which followes, He then *debased and humbled* himself, & took upon him the *forme of a servant*, there is not any forme of plea left from this example, here proposed, to the end aimed at. But now saies *Grotius*, His being in the *forme* of God, was his *working* of *miracles*; his *debasing himselfe*; his *being poore*; his *taking the forme of a servant*; *possessing nothing of his own*: But it is evident, that there was a *coincidence* of time as to these things, and so no *gradation* in the words at all: For then when Christ *wrought miracles*, He was so poore, and possessed nothing of his own; that there was no condescention nor relinquishment of one condition for another discernable therein. 2. The *forme* of a servant that Christ tooke was that, wherein he was *like* man; as it is expounded in the words next following; *he was made in the likenesse of man*; and what that is the same Apostle informes us, *Heb.* 2. 17. ὅθεν ὤφειλε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, *wherefore he ought in all things to be made like his brethren*: that is, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, *He was made in the likenesse of man*: or as it is expressed *Rom.* 8. 3. ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς, in the *likenesse of flesh*; which also is expounded *Gal.* 4. 4. γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, *made of a woman*; which gives us the manner of the accomplishment of that, *Joh.* 1. 14. ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, *the word was made flesh*. 3. The *employment* of Christ in that *likenes of man*, is confessly expressed in these words; Not his *condition*, that he had nothing, but his employment, that he was the servant of the Father, according as it was foretold that he should be, *Isa.* 42 1, 19. and which He every where professed himselfe to be. He goes on. §. 30.

Ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος: *cum similis esset hominibus,* §. 31.

illis

illis nempe primis; id est, peccati expers; 2 Cor.5.21. *whereas He was like men, namely those first, that is, without sin.*

§. 32. That Christ was *without sinne*, that in his being made like to us, there is an exception as to *sinne*, is readily granted. He was ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, Heb. 7.26. But 1. That Christ is ever said to be made like *Adam*, on that account, or is *compared* with him therein, cannot be proved. He was νήπιος ἄνθρωπος, & ἔκτος Ἀδάμ: but that he was made ἐν ὁμοιώματι τῷ Ἀδὰμ is not said. 2. This expression was sufficiently cleared by the particular places formerly urged. It is not of his *sinlessnesse* in that condition, of which the Apostle hath no occasion here to speak, but of his *Love* in *taking* on him that condition, in being sent in the likeneſse of sinfull flesh, yet without sinne, that these words are used. It is a likeneſse of *nature* to *all* men, and not a likeneſse of *innocency* to the *first*, that the Apostle speakes of: a likeneſse, wherein there is a ταυτότης, as to the *kinde*, a distinction in *number*: as *Adam begat a Sonne in his own likeneſse*, Gen.5.1.

§. 33. All that followes in the *Learned Annotator*, is only an endeavour to make the following words speak in some *Harmony*, and conformity to what he hath before delivered; which being discerned not to be suited to the mind of the Holy Ghost in the place, I have no such delight to contend about *Words*, *Phrases*, and *Expressions*, as to insist any farther upon them. Returne we to our *Catechists*.

§. 34. The place they next propose to themselves to deale withall, is 1 Tim.3.16. *And without controversy great is the mystery of Godlineſse, God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of Angells, and revealed unto the Gentiles, believed on in the World, received up into Glory.*

If it be here evinced, that by *God* is meant *Christ*, it being spoken *absolutely*, and in the place of the *subject* in the proposition, this businesse is at a perfect close, and our Adversaries following attempt, to ward themselves from the following blows of the sword of the Word, which cut them in pieces, is to no purpose, seeing their deaths wound lyes evident in the efficacy of this place. Now here not only the common Apprehension of all Professors of the name of Christ in Generall, but also the common sence of mankind, to be tryed in all that will but

read

read the Books of the New Testament, might righteously be appealed unto; but because these are things of no importance with them, with whom we have to do, we must insist on other considerations.

§. 35. 1. Then, that by the word θεὸς, God, *some person* is intended, is evident from hence, that the word is never used but to expresse *some person*; nor can in any place of the Scriptures be wrested possibly to denote any thing, but *some person*, to whom that name doth belong, or is ascribed, truly, or falsly. And if this be not certaine, and to be granted, there is nothing so, nor do we know any thing in the World, or the intendment of any one word in the Book of God. Nor is there any Reason pretended, why it should have any other Acceptation, but only an *impotent begging* of the thing in Question. It is not *so here*, though it be so every where else, because it agrees not with our *hypothesis*; λῆρος! 2. That Christ, who is the *second Person*, the *Son of God*, is here intended, and none else; is evident from hence, that what ever is here spoken of θεὸς, of this *God* here, was true, and fulfilled in him, as to the matter, and the same expressions for the most of the particulars, as to their *substance*, are used concerning him, and no other. Neither are they possible to be accommodated to any Person but him. Let us a little accommodate the words to him. 1. He who *as God*, was in the *beginning with* God, in his own nature invisible, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, *was manifested in the flesh*, when σὰρξ ἐγένετο, *when he was made flesh*, *Joh.* 1.14. and made ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς, *Rom:* 8. 3. in *the likenesse of flesh*, γενόμενος ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα: *Rom:* 1.3. so made *visible and conspicuous*, (or ἐφανερώθη, when ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν) *dwelling-amongst men, who also saw his glory, as the glory of the only begotten Son of God*, v.14. Being thus *manifest in the flesh*, having taken our nature on him, He was *reviled, persecuted, condemned, slaine* by the Jewes as a Malefactor, a seditious Person, an Impostor; But 2. ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, *He was justified in the spirit*, from all their false accusations and imputations: He was *justified by his Eternall spirit*, when he was *raised* from the dead, and *declared to be the Sonne of God with power*, thereby, *Rom:* 1. 4. for though He was *crucified through weakenesse, yet he liveth by the power of God*, 2 *Cor.* 13.4. so He also sent out *his spirit* to convince the World of sinne, because *they believed not in him*, and of Righte-

ouſneſſe, *becauſe he went to his Father*; *Joh.* 16.9,10. which he alſo did, *juſtifying himſelfe thereby*, to the conviction and converſion of many thouſands, who before condemned him, or conſented to his condemnation, upon the account formerly mentioned, *Act.* 2 37. And this is He, who 3. ὤφθη Ἀγγέλοις, *was ſeen of Angels*, and ſo hath his witneſſes in Heaven and Earth. For when he came firſt into the World, all the *Angels* receiving charg to *worſhip him*, by him who ſaid προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, *Heb.* 1.6 *one* came downe at his Nativity to declare it, to whom He *was ſeene*, and inſtantly a *multitude of the Heavenly Hoſt ſaw him*, *Luk.* 2 9,13. and afterwards went away into heaven; v.15. In the beginning alſo of his Miniſtry, *Angels* were ſent to him in *the Wildernesſe to miniſter to him*, *Math.* 4 11. and when he was going to his death in the garden, *an Angell was ſent to comfort him*, *Luk.* 22.43. And he then knew, that He could at a words ſpeaking, have more then *twelve Legions of Angels* to his aſſiſtance, *Mat.* 26.53. And when he roſe againe, the *Angels ſaw him againe, and ſerved him therein*, *Math.* 28.2. And as He ſhall *come againe with his holy Angels* to judgement, *Math.* 25. 31. 2 *Theſſ.* 1.7. ſo no doubt but in his *Aſſention* the *Angels* accompanied him: yea that they did ſo, is evident from *Pſal.* 68. 17, 18. So that there was no eminent concernment of him, wherein it is not expreſly affirmed, that ὤφθη Ἀγγέλοις: at his *Birth*, *Entrance* on his Miniſtry, *Death*, *Reſurrection*, *Aſſention*, ὤφθη Ἀγγέλοις. 4. Ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, *He was Preached unto the Gentiles*, or among the people, or Gentiles: which beſides the following Accompliſhment of it to the full, in the Preaching the Goſpell concerning him throughout the World, ſo it had a ſignall *entrance* in that Declaration of him to devout men dwelling at Jeruſalem, *out of every Nation under Heaven*, *Act.* 7.5. And hereupon; 5. Ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, *He was believed on in the World*; He that had been *rejected* as a vile perſon, condemned and ſlain, being thus *juſtifyed* in ſpirit, and *Preached*, was *believed* on, many thouſands being daily converted to the Faith of him, to believe that he was the *Meſſiah*, the Son of God, whom before they received not, *Joh.* 1.10,11. And for his own part, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ, *He was taken up into Glory*; the ſtory whereof we have, *Act.* 1.9,10,11. *when He had ſpoken to his Diſciples, He was taken up, and a cloud received him.* Of which *Luke* ſaies briefly, as *Paul* here

here, ἀνελήφθη, *Act.* 1. 2. as *Mark* also doth, Chap. 16. 19. ἀνελήφθη εἰς τ ὐρανὸν; that is, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ, *He was taken up into Heaven, or to Glory;* ἀνελήφθη, is as much as ἄνω ἐλήφθη, *He was taken up* (ἐν for εἰς) *into Glory.*

This Harmony of the description of Christ here, both as to his person and Office, with what is elsewhere spoken of him, (this being evidently a summary collection of what is more largely in the Gospell spoken of) makes it evident, that he is *God*, here intended: which is all that is needfull to be evinced from this place. §. 36.

Let us now heare our Catechists pleading for themselves. §. 37.

What doest thou Answer to 1 Tim. 3. 16?

"1. That in many antient Copies, and in the "vulgar Latine it selfe, the word, *God*, is not read; "wherefore from that place nothing certaine can "be concluded. 2. Although that word should be "read, yet there is no cause why it should not "be referred to the Father, seeing these things "may be affirmed of the Father: that he appea-"red in Christ, and the Apostles, who were flesh: "& for what is afterwards read, according to the "usuall translation, He was received into Glory, "in the Greeke it is, He was received in Glory, "that is, with Glory, or Gloriously.

Adtertium vero quid respondes?

Primum quidem, quod in multis exemplaribus vetustis & in ipsa vulgata, non legatur vox Deus. Quare ex eo loco certum nihil concludi potest. Deinde, etiamsi ea vox legeretur, nullam esse causam cur ad Patrem referri non possit, cùm hæc de Patre affirmari possint, eum apparuisse in Christo, & Apostolis qui caro fuerunt. Quod autem inferiùs legitur, secundum usitatam versionem, receptus est in gloriam, id in Græco habetur, receptus est in gloria, id est, cum gloria, aut gloriosè.

What then is the sence of this Testimony?

"That the Religion of Christ is full of Myste-"ries: for God, that is, his will, for the saving "of men, was perfectly made known by infirme "& mortall men; and yet because of the Miracles "and various powerfull workes, which were "performed by such weake mortall men, it was "acknowledged for true, and it was at length "perceived by the Angells themselves, and was "preached not only to the Jewes, but also to the "Gentiles; all Believed thereon, and it was re-"ceived with great glory after an eminent man-"ner.

Quæ vero futura est hujus testimonii sententia?

Religionem Christi plenam esse mysteriis. Nam Deus, id est, voluntas ipsius de servandis hominibus, per homines infirmos & mortales perfectè patefacta est: & nihilominus tamen propter miracula, & virtutes varias, quæ per homines illos infirmos & mortales edita fuerant, pro vera est agnita: eadem ab ipsis Angelis fuit demum perspecta; non solum Judæis, verum etiam gentibus fuit prædicata: omnes ei crediderunt, & insignem in modum, & summa cum gloria recepta fuit.

Thus they; meerly rather then say nothing, or yeild to the truth. Briefely to remove what they offer in way of Exception or Assertion.

§. 39. 1. Though the word *God*, be not in the *vulgar latine*, yet the unanimous constant consent of all the Originall Copies, confessed to be so, both by *Beza*, and *Erasmus*, is sufficient to evince, that the losse of that word in that translation, is not of any import to weaken the sence of the place. Of other *antient* copies whereof they boast, they cannot instance one; in the vulgar also, it is evident, that by the *Mystery*, Christ is understood.

§. 40. 2. That what is here spoken *MAY be referred to the Father*, is a very sorry shift, against the evidence of all those considerations, which shew, that it *OUGHT* to be referred to the *Son*.

§. 41. 3. It *may* not, it *cannot* with any tollerable sence, be referred to the Father. It is not said, *that in Christ and the Apostles he appeared*, and was *seen of Angells*, &c. that is spoken of; but that *God was manifested in the flesh*, &c. nor is any thing, that is here spoken of God, any where ascribed, *no not once* in the Scripture, to the Father. How was he *manifested in the flesh*, how was he *justifyed in the Spirit*, how was He *taken up into glory*?

§. 2. 4. Though ἐν δόξῃ, may be rendred *gloriously, or with glory*, yet ἀνελήφθη, may not, *receptus est*, but rather *assumptus est*; and is applyed to the *Assension* of Christ in other places, as hath been shewed.

2. For the sence they tender of these words; Let them

§. 43. 1. Give any one instance, where *God*, is put for the *will of God*, and that exclusively to any person of the Deity, or to speake to their own *Hypothesis*, exclusively to the *Person* of God. This is intollerable boldnesse, and argues something of seatednesse.

2. The *will of God* for the salvation of men, is the *Gospell*: how are these things applyable to that? How was the *Gospell justifyed* in the spirit; how was it *received* into Gory, how was it *seen* of the Angels, ὤφθη Ἀγγέλοις? In what place is any thing of all this spoken of the *Gospell*? Of Christ all this is spoken, as hath been said. In summe, the *Will* of God is no where said to be *manifest in the flesh*, Christ was so. That the *will of God should be preached by weake mortall men*, was no *great Mystery*; that God *should assume humane nature*, is so. The will of God cannot

not be said to *appeare to the Angells*, Christ did so. Of the last expression there can be no doubt raised.

§. 44. *Grotius* insists upon the same interpretation with our *Catechists* in the whole, and in every part of it: nor doth he adde any thing to what they plead, but only some *quotations* of Scripture, not at all to the purpose; or at best suited to his own *Apprehensions* of the sence of the place, not opening it in the least, or evincing what he embraces, to be the mind of the Holy Ghost, to any one that is otherwise minded. What he sayes, *because he sayes it*, deserves to be considered.

§. 45. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ: *suspectam nobis hanc lectionem faciunt interpretes veteres, Latinus, Syrus, Arabs, & Ambrosius, qui omnes legunt* ὃ ἐφανερώθη. *Addit Hincmarus Opusculo* 55. *illud* Θεὸς *hic positum a Nestorianis.* But this *suspicion* might well have been removed from this *learned man*, by the *universall* consent of *all originall* Copies, wherein as it seemes his own *manuscript*, that sometimes helps him at a need, doth not differ 2: One corruption in one translation makes many. 3. The *Syriack* reads the word *God*, and so *Tremelius* hath rendred it. *Ambrose* and *Hincmarus* followed the *latine* translation. And there is a thousand times more probability, that the word Θεὸς was *filch'd* out by the *Arians*, then that it was *foysted* in by the *Nestorians*. But if the Agreement of all Originall Copies may be thus contemned, we shall have nothing certaine left us. But saith he; *sensum bonum facit illud* ὃ ἐφανερώθη. *Evangelium illud cæleste innotuit primum non per Angelos, sed per homines mortales, & quantum externa species ferebat infirmos, Christum, & Apostolos ejus.* ἐφανερώθη *bene convenit mysterio, id est, rei latenti*: Col. 1. 26, σὰρξ *hominem significat mortalem*: 2 Cor: 2. 16. 1 John 4. 2.

§. 46. 1. Our *Annotatour* having only a *suspicion* that the word Θεὸς was not in the text, ought on all accounts to have interpreted the words according to the reading, whereof he had the better *perswasion*, and not according unto that, whereof he had only a *suspicion*. But then it was by no meanes easy to accommodate them according to his intention, nor to exclude the *Person* of Christ frō being mentioned in them, which by joyning in with his *suspicion* h: thought himself able to do. 2. He is not able to give us any one instance in the Scripture, of the like expression to this, of *manifest in the flesh*, being referred to

the Gospell; when referred to Christ, nothing is more frequent; *John* 1.14. *John* 6.53. *Acts* 2.31. *Rom.* 1.3, *Rom*: 8.3. *Rom*: 9.5, *Ephes*: 2.14,15. *Col*: 1.22. *Heb*: 5.7. *Heb*. 10.19,20. 1 *Pet*: 3.18. 1 *Pet*: 4.1. 1 *John* 4.2. &c. Of the *flesh of the Gospell*, not one word. 3. There is not the least opposition intimated, between *men* and *Angels*, as to the meanes of preaching the Gospell; nor is this any mystery, that the Gospell was preached by men; ἐφανερώθη is well applyed to a *mystery* or *hidden thing*; but the question is, what the *mystery or hidden thing* is; we say it was the great matter of the *words being made flesh*, as it is elsewhere expressed. In the place urged out of the *Corinthians*, whether it be the 2. or 11. Chapter that is intended, there is nothing to prove, that σὰρξ signifyes a mortall man. And this is the entrance of this exposition; Let us proceed.

§. 47. Ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι; *per plurima miracula approbata est ea veritas.* Πνεῦμα *sunt miracula divina, per* μετωνυμίαν *quæ est* 1 *Cor.* 11.4. *& alibi. Justifyed in the Spirit; that is, approved by many miracles; for* πνεῦμα *is miracles by a metonymy.* Then let every thing be as the *Learned man* will have it. It is in vaine to contend. For surely never was expression so wrested. That πνεῦμα, simply, is *miracles*, is false; that to have a thing done ἐν πνεύματι, signifies *miracles*, is more evidently so; 1 *Cor.* 2. 4. The Apostle speakes not at all of *miracles*, but of the efficacy of the Spirit with him in his preaching the word, to *convince the world of sinne, Righteousnesse, and Judgment*, according to the promise of Christ. The application of this expression to Jesus Christ see above. He addes, δικαιώθαι (is here) *approbare, ut Matth.* 11. 19. It is here to *approve*, and that because it was necessary that the *Learned Annotatour* should δελέυειν τοῦ θεοῦ. In what sence the word is taken, and how applyed to Christ, with the genuine meaning of the place, see above. See also, *Joh.* 1. 33, 34. nor is the Gospell any where said to be *Justifyed in Spirit*, nor is this a tollerable exposition, *justifyed in spirit*, that is, it was *approved by miracles*.

§. 48. Ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις *nempe cum admiratione, Angeli hoc arcanum per homines mortales didicere*; *Ephes*. 3. 10. 1 *Pet.* 1.12. How eminently this suits what is spoken of Jesus Christ, was shewed before. It is true, the *Angells* as with admiration looke into the things of the Gospell; but that it is said, the Gospell ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, is not proved.

It

It is true, the Gospel was *Preached to the Gentiles*; but yet this word is most frequently applyed to Christ, *Act.* 3. 20. *Act.* 8 25. Chap. 9. 20. Chap. 19. 13. 1 *Cor.* 1. 23. 1 *Cor.* 15. 12. 2 *Cor.* 1. 19. 2 *Cor.* 4. 5. 2 *Cor.* 11. 4. *Phil.* 1. 15. are Testimonies hereof. §. 49.

Ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, *id est, in magna mundi parte*, *Rom.* 1. 8. *Col.* 1. 6. But then I pray, what difference between ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, and ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ? The first is, it was *approved by miracles*, the other, it was *believed*; now to approve the truth of the Gospell, taken actively, is to believe it. How much more naturally this is accommodated to Christ, see *Joh.* 3. 17, 18. & v. 35, 36. *Joh.* 6. 40. *Act.* 10. 43. and Chap. 16. 31. *Rom.* 3. 22. *Rom.* 10 8. 9. *Gal.* 2 16. 1 *Joh.* 5 5. &c. §. 50.

The last clause is, ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ; *Gloriosè admodum exaltatum est, nempe quia majorem attulit sanctitatem, quàm ulla ante hæc dogmata.* And this must be the sence of the place, without any colour, much lesse evidence of proofe. For the sence of the word ἀναλαμβάνομαι in this businesse, see *Luk* 9. 51. *Mar.* 16. 19. *Act.* 1. 2. v. 11. & v. 22. And in this sence we are indifferent, whether ἐν δόξῃ, be εἰς δόξαν, *unto glory*, which seems to be most properly intended, or σὺν δόξῃ, *with Glory*, as our Adversaries would have it, or *gloriously*, as *Grotius*; for it was *gloriously*, with *great Glory*, and *into that Glory*, which He had with his Father before the World was. That the Gospell is Glorious in its Doctrine of Holinesse is true, but not at all spoken of in this place. §. 51.

Heb. 2. 16. is another Testimony insisted on, to prove the incarnation of Christ, and so consequently his subsistence in a divine nature antecedently thereunto. The words are: *For verily, he took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham.* To this they Answer; that §. 52.

"Herein not so much as any likenesse of the "incarnation, as they call it, doth appeare. For "this writer doth not say, that Christ took (as "some read it, and commonly they take it in "that sence) but He takes. Nor doth he say, hu"mane nature, but the seed of Abraham: which "in the Holy Scriptures denotes them, who be"lieve in Christ, as *Gal.* 3. 29.

In eo, ne similitudinem quidem incarnationis (ut vocant) apparere, cùm is Scriptor non dicat, Christum assumpsisse (ut quidam reddunt, & vulgo eo sensu accipiunt) sed assumere: nec dixit, naturâ humanâ, sed semen Abrahæ quod in literis sacris notat eos, qui in Christum crediderunt, ut Gal 3. 29. *videre est.*

What

Quid vero sensus huius erit loci? Id sibi vult is Scriptor, Christum non esse Servatorem Angelorum, sed hominum credentium, qui quoniam & afflictionibus & morti subjecti sunt (quam rem superius expressit per participationem carnis & sanguinis) propterea Christus ultro illis se submisit, ut fideles suos a mortis metu liberaret, & in omni afflictione iisdem opem afferret.

What then is the sence of this place?

"This is that which this Writer intends, that "Christ is not the Saviour of Angells, but of "men believing, who because they are subject to "afflictions and death, (which He before expres- "sed by the participation of flesh and blood) "therefore did Christ willingly submit himselfe "unto them, that he might deliver his faithfull "ones from the feare of death, and might helpe "them in all their afflictions.

§. 54. The sence of this place is *evident*; the Objections against it *weake*. That the word is ἐπιλαμβάνεται, not ἐπιλάβετο, *assumit*, not *assumpsit*, is an *Enallage* of *Tense* so usuall, as that it can have no force of an Objection. And v. 14. it is twice used in a contrary sence; the time *past*, being put for the *present*, as here the *present*, for that which is past: κεκοινώνηκε, for κοινωνεῖ; and μετέχε for μετέκει: see *Joh*: 3. 31. *Joh:* 21. 13. 2. That by the *seed of Abraham*, is here intended the *humane nature* of the *seed of Abraham*, appears. 1. From the expression going before of the same import with this; *He took part of Flesh and Blood*, v: 14. 2. From the opposition here made to *Angels*, or the *Angelicall nature*; the Holy Ghost shewing, that the businesse of Christ being to save his Church by dying for them, was not therefore to take upon him an *Angelicall*, *spirituall substance*, or nature, but the nature of man. 3. The same thing is elsewhere in like manner expressed: as where He is said to be made of the *seed of David according to the flesh*, *Rom*: 1. 3. and to *come of the Fathers as concerning the flesh*, *Rom*: 9. 5. 4. Believers are called *Abrahams seed* sometimes *spiritually*, in relation to the Faith of *Abraham*, as *Gal*: 3. 29. where he is expressly spoken of, as *Father of the Faithfull*, by inheriting the Promises: but take it *absolutely*, to be of the *seed of Abraham*, is no more, but to be a *man of his posterity*, *Joh:* 8. 37. *I know that ye are Abrahams seed*, *Rom.* 9. 7. *Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all Children*, v. 8. that is, *they are the Children of the flesh*: so *Rom.* 11. 1. *Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I*, 2 *Cor.* 11. 22. 2. For the sence assigned; it is evident, that in these words the Apostle treats not of the *help given*, but of the *way whereby* Christ came to help his Church, and the means thereof; his actuall

ctuall helping and relieving of them is mentioned in the next verſe. 2. Here is no mention in this verſe of *Believers being obnoxious to Afflictions and Death*, ſo that theſe words of theirs may ſerve for an Expoſition of ſome other place of Scripture, (as they ſay of *Gregories* Comment on *Job*) but not of this. 3. By *partaking of Fleſh and Blood*, is not meant *primarily*, being *obnoxious to death and afflictions*; nor doth that expreſſion in any place ſignify any ſuch thing; though ſuch a nature, as is ſo obnoxious, be intended. The Argument then from hence ſtands ſtill in its force; that Chriſt ſubſiſting in his divine nature, did *aſſume an humane nature* of the *ſeed of Abraham*, into *Perſonall union* with himſelfe.

Grotius is ſtill at a perfect agreement with our *Catechiſts*. Saith he, ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι *apud Platonem, & alios, eſt ſolenniter vindicare, his autem & ſuperioribus intelligendum eſt, vindicare, ſeu aſſerere in libertatem manu injectâ.* "This word in *Plato* and others, is to vindi- "cate into liberty; here, as is to be underſtood from what "went before, it is to aſſert into Liberty by laying hold with the hand. Of the Firſt, becauſe he gives no inſtances, we ſhall need take no farther notice. The Second is denyed; both the *helpe afforded*, and the *meanes* of it by Chriſt, is mentioned before. The *help* is Liberty: the meanes, *partaking of Fleſh and Blood to dye*. Theſe words are not expreſſive of, nor do anſwer the latter, or the *help afforded*, but the *means* for the obtaining of it, as hath been declared. But he adds, *the word ſignifies to lay hold of with the hand, as Mark* 8. 23. *&c.* Be it granted that it doth ſo; *to lay hold with the hand, and to take to ones ſelfe*. This is not to aſſert into Liberty, but by the help of a *Metaphor*: and when the word is uſed *Metaphorically*, it is to be interpreted *pro ſubjectâ materiâ*, according to the ſubject matter: which here is Chriſts taking *a nature upon him, that was of Abraham*, that was *not Angelicall*. The other expreſſion he is ſingular in the interpretation of. §. 55.

He took the ſeed of Abraham: id eſt, *id agit, ut vos Hebræos liberet a peccatis & metu mortis; eventus enim nomen ſæpe datur operæ, in id impenſæ*. That is, "He doth that, that he may deliver you He- "brews from ſinne, and feare of death: the name of the e- "vent, is often given to the work imployed to that purpoſe. But 1. Here I confeſſe, he takes another way from our *Cate-* §. 56.

chists; the *seed of Abraham* is with them, *Believers*; with him, only *Jews*; but the *tails* of their discourse are tyed together with a *firebrand* between them, to devoure the *harvest* of the Church. 2. This *taking the seed of Abraham*, is opposed to his *not taking the seed of Angells*; now the *Jews* are not universally opposed to *Angels* in this thing, but *humane kind*. 3. He *took the seed of Abraham*, is it seems, He *endeavoured to help the Jewes*. The whole discourse of the *help* afforded both before and after this verse, is extended to the whole *Church*; how comes it here to be restrained to the *Jewes* only. 4. The discourse of the Apostle is about the undertaking of Christ by *death*, and his being fitted thereunto by partaking of *flesh and blood*; which is so farre from being in any place restrained or accommodated only to the *Jewes*, as that the contrary is every where asserted, as is known to all.

§. 57. 1 *John* 4.3. *Every Spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; He who comes into the world*, or comes into flesh, or in the flesh, had a subsistence before he so came. It is very probable, that the intendment of the Apostle was to discover the *Abomination* of them, who denyed Christ to be a *true man*, but assigned him a *phantastical* body, which yet he so doth, as to expresse his *coming in the flesh* in such a manner, as evidences him to have another nature (as was said) besides that which is here *Synecdochically* called flesh. Our Catechists to this

§. 58. say,

Etiam in eo nihil prorsus de incarnatione (quam vocant) haberi. Etenim quod apud quosdam legitur, venit in carnem, in Græco habetur, in carne venit. Propterea non scribit Joannes, quòd spiritus, qui confitetur Jesum Christum, qui in carne venit, ex Deo est. Sed quod ille Spiritus qui confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse ex Deo est. Quorum verborum sensus est, eum spiritum ex Deo esse, qui confitetur Jesum illum, qui munus suum in terris sine ulla pompa & ostentatione mundana, summa cum humilitate (quoad exteriorem speciem) summo; cum contemptu obiverit, mortem dniq; ignominiosam oppetierit, esse Christum, & populi Dei regem.

"That this is not to the purpose in hand; for "that which some read, He came into the flesh, is "not in the Greeke, but he came in the flesh. "Moreover, *John* doth not write, that Spirit which "confesseth Jesus Christ, which came in the flesh, "is of God; but that that Spirit which confesseth "Jesus Christ, who is come in the flesh is of God. "The sence of which words, is that the Spirit is of "God, which confesseth that Jesus Christ, who "performed his office in the earth, without any "pompe or worldly ostentation, with great hu"mility, as to outward appearance, and great "contempt, & lastly, underwent a contumelious "death, is Christ, & King of the people of God.

I shall

I shall not contend with them about the translation of the words: ἐν σαρκὶ, seemes to be put for εἰς σαρκά; but the intendment is the same; for the word *came* is ἐληλυθότα, that is, that *came*, or *did come*. 2. It is not τὸν ἐληλυθότα, *who did come*, that thence any colour should be taken for the exposition given by them, of confessing that Christ, or him who is the Christ, the King of the people of God, or confessing him to be the Christ, the King of the people of God; but it is, that confesseth him *who came in the flesh*, that is, as to his whole Person and office, his coming, and what he came for. 3. They cannot give us any example, nor any one Reason, to evince, that that should be the meaning of ἐν σαρκὶ, which here they pretend. The meaning of it hath above been abundantly declared. So that there is no need that we should insist longer on this place. Nor why we should trouble our selves with *Grotius* his long discourse on this place. The whole foundation of it is, that to *come in the flesh*, signifies to come in a low, abject condition; a pretence without proofe, without evidence. *Flesh* may sometimes be taken so; but that to come in the *flesh*, is to come in such a condition, we have not the least plea pretended. §. 59.

The last place they mention to this purpose is, *Heb.* 10. 5. *Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.* He who had a *body* prepared for him, when he came into the world, he subsisted in *another nature*, before that coming of his into the world. To this they say. §. 60.

§. 61

"Neither is there here any mention made of "the incarnation, (as they call it) seeing that "world, into which the Author sayes Christ en- "tred, is the world to come, as was above demon- "strated. Whence to come into the world, doth "not signify to be borne into the world, but to "enter into Heaven. Lastly, in these words, a "body hast thou prepared me, that word a body "(as appeared from what was said, where his "entring this world was treated of) may be ta- "ken for an immortall body.

Nekic quidem de incarnatione (ut vocant) ullam mentionem factam, cum is mundus, in quem ingressum Jesum is autor ait, sit ille mundus futurus, ut superius demonstratum est. Unde etiam ingredi in illum mundum, non nasci in mundum, sed in cœlum ingredi significat. Deinde, illis verbis, Corpus aptasti mihi, corporis vox (ut ex eo apparuit, ubi de ingressu hoc in mundum actum est) pro corpore immortali accipi potest.

§. 62. *Quæ sententia ejus loci est? Deum Jesu tale corpus aptasse, postquam in cælum est ingressus, quod ad obeundum munus Pontificis summi aptum & accommodatum foret.*

What is the sence of this place?

"That God fitted for Jesus such a body, after "He entred Heaven, as is fit and accommodate "for the discharging of the duty of an High "Priest.

§. 63. But doubtlesse, then this whole *dreame* nothing can be more fond or absurd. How many times is it said, that Christ *came into this world*, where *no other world* but this can be understood? For this cause saith he, *came I into the world*, that I might beare witnesse to the truth? *Joh.* 18. Was it into *Heaven* that Christ *came* to beare witnesse to the truth? *Jesus Christ came into the world* to save sinners, 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. was it into Heaven? 2. These words, *a body hast thou prepared me*, are a full expression of what is *Synecdochically* spoken of in the *Psalmes*, in these words, *mine eares hast thou opened*, expressing the end also why Christ had a body prepared him, namely, that he might *yeild obedience to God therein*, which he did signally in this world, when he was *obedient to death, the death, of the crosse*. 3. as I have before manifested the groundlessenesse of interpreting the word *world*, put absolutely, of the *world to come*, and so taken off all, that here they relate unto, so in that *Demonstration*, which God assisting I shall give, of Christs being a *Priest*, and *offering sacrifice in this world*, before he entred into Heaven. I shall remove what farther here they pretend unto. In the mean time, such expressions as this, that have no light, nor colour given them from the Text they pretend to unfold, had need of good strength of *Analogie* given them from elsewhere, which here is not pretended. *When he comes into the world*, that is, when He *enters Heaven*; he sayes, *a body hast thou prepared me*, that is, *an immortall body thou hast given me*, and that by this *immortall body* they intend indeed *no body*, I shall afterward declare.

§. 64. *Grotius* turnes these words quite another way, not agreeing with our *Catechists*; yet doing still the same worke with them: which because he gives no proofe of his exposition, it shall suffice so to have intimated: In summe, v. 4. he tels us, how the *blood of Christ takes away sinne*, viz. *because it begets faith in us, and gives right to Christ for the obtaining of all necessary helps for us*, in pursuit

pursuit of his former interpretation of *chap.* 9. where he wholy excludes the *satisfaction* of Christ. His coming into the world, is (he sayes) *his shewing himselfe to the world, after he had lead a private life therein for a while*; contrary to the perpetuall use of that expression in the New Testament; and so the whole designe of the place is eluded; the exposition whereof I shall deferre to the place of the satisfaction of Christ.

And these are the Texts of Scripture our Catechists thought good to endeavour a delivery of themselves from, as to that *Head* or Argument of our plea, for his subsistence in a divine nature, antecedently to his being borne of the Virgin, namely, because he is said to be *incarnate*, or *made flesh*. §. 65.

CHAP. XIV.

Sundry other Testimonies, given to the Deity of Christ, vindicated.

IN the next place they heap up a great many Testimonies confusedly, containing *Scripturall Attributions* unto Christ, of such things as manifest him to be God, which we shall consider in that *order*, or rather *disorder*, wherein they are placed of them. §. 1.

Their first question here is. §. 2.

In what Scriptures is Christ called God?

"Joh. 1 1. The word was God. Joh. 20.28. "*Thomas* saith unto Christ, my Lord, and my "God. Rom. 9.5. The Apostle saith, that Christ "is God over all blessed for ever.

In quibus Scripturis Christus vocatur deus?

Joan. 1. v. 1. & verbum fuit deus; & cap. 20. v. 28. Thomas ad Christum ait, dominus meus, & deus meus; & Rom. 9. v. 5. Apostolus scribit Christum deum (esse) supra omnes benedictum in secula.

What can be proved by these Testimonies?

"That a divine nature cannot be demonstra-"ted from them, besides the things that are before "produced, is hence manifest, that in the first "Testimony, the word is spoken of, and *John* "saith that he was with God: In the second "*Thomas* calleth him God, in whose feet and hands

Quid his testimoniis effici potest.

Naturam divinam in Christo ex iis demonstrari non posse, praeter ea quae superius allata

"he found the print of the nailes, and of the "speare in his side: and *Paul* calleth him, who "according to the flesh was of the Fathers, God "over all blessed for ever: all which cannot be "spoken of him, who by nature is God; "for thence it would follow, that there "are two Gods, of whom one was with the o-"ther: and these things, to have the prints of "wounds, and to be of the Fathers, belong "wholy to a man; which were absurd to as-"cribe to him, who is God by nature. And if "any one shall pretend that vaile of the distinc-"on of natures, we have above removed that, and "have shewed, that this distinction cannot be "maintained.

sunt, hinc manifestum est, quod in primo testimonio agatur de verbo, quod Joannes testatur apud illum Deum fuisse. In secundo Thomas eum appellat deum, in cujus pedibus & manibus clavorum, in latere lanceæ vestigia deprehendit; & Paulus eum, qui secundum carnem a patribus erat, deum supra omnia benedictum vocat. Quæ omnia dici de eo, qui natura deus sit nullo modo posse, planum est. Etenim ex illo sequeretur duos esse deos, quorum alter apud alterum fuerit. Hæc vero, vestigia vulnerum habere, ex patribus esse, hominis sunt prorsus; quæ ei qui natura deus sit, ascribi nimis absonum esset. Quod si illud distinctionis naturarum velum quis prætendat, jam superius illud amovimus & docuimus, hanc distinctionem nullo modo posse sustineri.

§. 4. That in all this Answer our Catechists do nothing but *begge the thing in Question*, and fly to their own *Hypothesis*, not against assertions but Arguments, themselves so farre know, as to be forced to *Apologize* for it in the close. That Christ is not God, because He is *not the Person of the Father*; that he is not God, because *He is man*, is the summe of their Answer. And yet these men knew, that we insisted on these Testimonies to prove him God, *though He be man*, and though He be *not the same Person* with the Father. 2. They do all along impose upon us their own most *false hypothesis*; That Christ is *God*, although He be *not God by Nature*. Those who are not God *by Nature*, and yet pretend to be Gods, are *Idols*, and shall be destroyed. And they only are the men, who affirme there are *two Gods*; one who is *so by Nature*, and another *made* so, one indeed God, and no man, the other *a man*, and *no God*: the Lord our God, is one God. 3. In particular, *John* 1.1. the *Word* is Christ, as hath been above abundantly demonstrated. Christ in respect of another nature, that he had before *He took flesh, and dwelt with men*: v. 14. Herein is He said to be *with the Father*, in respect of his *distinct personall subsistence*, who was one with the Father, as to his *nature and Essence*

sence. And this is that which we prove from this Testimony, which will not be warded with a bare deniall. *The word was with God, and the word was God. God by nature*, and *with God in his personall distinction*. 4. *Thomas* confesses him to be his *Lord* and *God*, in whose *hands* and *feet* he *saw the print of the nailes*; as God is said to Redeem the Church with his own blood. He was the *Lord and God of Thomas*, who in his humane nature shed his blood, and had the print of the nailes in his hands and feet. Of this *confession* of *Thomas* I have spoken before; & therefore I shall not now farther insist upon it. He whom *Thomas* in the *Confession of his faith*, as a *Believer*, owned for his *Lord and God*, He is the true God, God by nature; of a *made God*, *a God by Office*, to be confessed and believed in, the Scripture is utterly silent. 5. The same is affirmed of Ro. 9. 5. The Apostle distinguishes of Christ, as to his *flesh*, and as to his *Deity*; as to his *flesh*, *or humane nature*, he sayes, he was of the *Fathers*: but in the other regard He is *God over all blessed for ever*. And as this is a signall expression of the *true* God, God *over all blessed for ever*, so there is no occasion of that expression, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, *as to the Flesh*, but to assert something in *Christ*, which he afterwards affirmes to be his everlasting Deity, in regard whereof he is not of the Fathers. He is then of the Fathers, τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Ἀμήν. The words are most *emphatically* expressive of the Eternall Deity of Christ, in contradistinction to what he received of the Fathers: ὁ ὤν, even then when he tooke *Flesh* of the Fathers, then *was* he, and now *he is*, and ever *will* be God over all; that is, the *most High* God blessed for ever. It is evident, that the Apostle intends to ascribe to Christ here, two most solemne Attributes of God; the *most High*, and the *Blessed* one. Nor is this Testimony to be parted with for their begging, or with their importunity. 6. It is our Adversaries who say, there are two Gods, as hath been shewed, not we; and the *prints of wounds* are proper to him who is God by nature, though not in that regard, on the account whereof he is so. 7. What they have said to oppose the distinction of *two natures*, in the *one Person* of Christ, hath already been considered, and manifested to be false and frivolous.

I could wish to these Testimonies they had added one or two more; as that of *Isaiah* 54. 5. *Thy maker is thine Husband*, §. 5.

He

the Lord of Hosts is his name, and thy Redeemer the Holy one of Israel, the God of the whole Earth shall He be called. That Jesus Christ is the *Husband* & *Spouse* of the Church, will not be denyed, *Eph:* 5.25. *Revel:* 21 9. but he who is so, is *the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, the Lord of the whole Earth.* And *Heb.* 3.4. the Apostle saies, that, *He that made all things is God*; that is, *his Church*; for of that he treats: He that *created all things*, that is, *the Church, as well as all other things*, He is God; none could do it but God: *but Christ built this house*: v.3. But this is not my present imployment.

§. 6. The Learned *Grotius* is pittifully entangled about the two last places urged by our *Catechists*. Of his *slight* in dealing with that of *Ioh.* 20. 28. I have spoken before, and discovered the vanity of his insinuations. Here he tells you, *that after Christs Resurrection, it grew common with the Christians to call him God*, and urges *Rom:* 9.5. but coming to expound that place, he finds that shift will not serve the turne, it being not any *Christians calling of him God*, that there is mentioned, but the blessed Apostle plainly affirming, that *He is God over all, blessed for ever*; and therefore forgetting what he had said *before*, he falls upon a worse, and more *desperate evasion*, affirming, that the word Θεὸς, ought not to be in the Text: because *Erasmus* had observed, that *Cyprian* and *Hilary*, citing this Text, did not name the word: and this he rests upon; although he knew, that *all Originall copies* whatever, constantly without any exception do read it; and that *Beza* had manifested against *Erasmus*, that *Cyprian lib. ad Judæ 2. cap.* 5. and *Hilary ad Psal.* 12. do both cite this place to prove, that *Christ is called God*, though they do not expresse the Text to the full. And it is known, how *Athanasius* used it against the *Arians*, without any hesitation, as to the corruption of the Text. This way of *shifting* indeed is very *wretched*, and not to be pardoned. I am well contented with *all*, that from what he writes on *Iohn* 1.1. (the first place mentioned) do apprehend, that when he wrote his *Annotations* on that place, he was no opposer of the Deity of Christ: but I must take leave to say, that for mine own part, I am not able to collect from all there spoken *in his own words*, that he doth at all assert the assuming of the humane Nature into Personall Subsistence with the Son of God: I speake as to the thing it selfe, and not to the expressions which he disallowes. But we must proceed with our *Catechists*.

Where

Where doth the Scripture testify that Christ is one with the Father?

§. 7.

Ubi vero Scriptura testatur Christum cum Patre esse unum?

Joh. 10. 29, 30, 31. *My Father which gave them me, is greater then all; and no man is able to pluck them out of his hand. I and my Father are one. Then the Jews took up stones againe to stone him.*

Joan. 10. v. 29, 30. *Ubi Dominus ait; Pater qui mihi (oves) dedit, major omnibus est, & nemo eas rapere potest è manibus Patris mei: Ego & Pater unum sumus.*

How dost thou Answer this Testimony?

§. 8.

"That from hence that Christ is said to be one "with the Father, that it cannot be proved that "He is one with him in nature, the words of "Christ to his Father of the Disciples do shew, "*Joh.* 17. 11. That they may be one as we are; and "a little after, v. 22. *That they may be one, even as we* "*are one.* That Christ is one with the Father, "this ought to be understood either of Will, or "Power, in the businesse of our Salvation. "Whence that a divine nature cannot be proved, "is manifest from those places, where Christ saith, "his Father is greater then all, and consequently "then Christ himselfe, as He expressly confesseth, "and that he gave him his sheep, *Joh.* 14. 28.

Quâ ratione respondes ad id testimonium? Ex eo, quod dicatur Christus esse cum patre unum, effici non posse, esse unum cum eo natura, verba Christi, quæ ad Patrem de discipulis habuit, demonstrant. Joan. 17. 11. *Pater sancte, serva illos in nomine tuo, ut sint unum, quemadmodum & nos unum sumus.* Et paulo inferius, v. 22. *Ego gloriam quam dedisti mihi, dedi illis, ut sint unum, quemadmodum nos unum sumus. Quod verò Christus sit unum cum Patre, hoc aut de voluntate, aut de potentia in salutis nostræ ratione accipi debet: unde naturam divinam non probari ex eodem loco constat, ubi Christus ait, Patrem omnibus esse majorem, ac proinde etiam ipso Domino, quemadmodum idem Dominus expressè fatetur, & quod eas oves ei dederit,* Joan 14. 28.

Of this place I have spoken before: That it is an *Unity of Essence* that is here intended by our Saviour, appears; 1. From the Apprehension the *Iews* had of his meaning in those words, who immediatly upon them *took up stones to stone him* for blasphemy, rendering an account of their so doing v. 33. *because he being a man, did make himselfe God.* 2. From the exposition He makes himselfe of his words, v. 36, *I am the Son of God*: that is it I intended; I am *so one* with him, as *a Son is with the Father*, that is, *one* in Nature and Essence. 3. He is *so one* with him, as that the Father *is in him*, and *He in him*, by a *divine immanency of Persons.* 2. Those words of our Saviour, *Joh.* 17. 12, 22. do not argue *a parity in the union of Believers among themselves*, with that of him

§. 9.

and his Father, but a *similitude*; (see *Math.* 17. 20.) that they *may be one in Affection*, as his Father and He are in *Essence*. We are to be *holy*, as God is Holy. 2. If *Oneneſſe of Will and conſent* be the ground of this, that the Son and Father are one; then the Angels and God are one, for with their Wills they *alwaies* do his. 3. *Oneneſſe of Power* with God, in any worke, argues oneneſſe of Eſſence. Gods Power is *Omnipotent*, and none can be *one* with him *in Power*, but He who is Omnipotent; that is, *who is God*. And if it be Unity of Power here aſſerted, it is ſpoken *abſolutely*, and not referred to any particular kind of thing. 4. It is true, God the Father *is greater* then Chriſt, as is affirmed *Ioh.* 14. 28. in reſpect of his *office* of *Mediation*, of which there He treats; but they are *One*, and *Equall* in reſpect of *Nature*. Neither is God in this place ſaid to be *greater then all*, in reſpect of Chriſt, who is ſaid to be one with him, but in reference to *all*, that may be ſuppoſed to attempt the *taking of his ſheep out of his hands*. 5. Chriſt *took*, or *received his ſheep*, not ſimply as God, the Eternall Son of God, but as *Mediatour*; and ſo his Father was *greater* then He. This Teſtimony then abides; He that is *One* with the Father, is *God by Nature*: Chriſt is thus *one* with the Father: (*One*) is the Unity of Nature; (*are*) their diſtinction of Perſons. *I and my Father are one.*

§. 10. *Grotius* adheres to the ſame expoſition with our *Catechiſts*, only he goes one ſtep farther in corrupting the Text. His words are, ἐγὼ καὶ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμέν: *connectit quod dixerat cum ſuperioribus: ſi Patris poteſtati eripi non poterunt, nec meæ poterunt: nam mea poteſtas a Patre emanat, & quidem ita, ut tantundem valeat a me, aut a Patre cuſtodiri: vid: Gen.* 41. 25, 27. I ſuppoſe he means v. 44. being the words of *Pharaoh*, delegating Power and Authority immediatly under him to *Ioſeph*; but, as it is known, *poteſtas* is ἐξουσία, Authority, & may belong to Office: but *potentia* is δύναμις, *force, vertue*, or *power*, & belongs to Eſſence. It is not *poteſtas* or *Authority* that Chriſt ſpeaks of, but *ſtrength, might*, and *Power*; which is ſo great in God, that none can take his ſheep out of his hand. Now though *unitas poteſtatis*, do not prove Unity of Eſſence in men, yet *unitas potentiæ*, which is here ſpoken of, in God evidently doth: yea none can have *unitatem Poteſtatis* with God, but he who hath *unitatem Eſſentiæ*.

§. 11. What they except in the next place againſt Chriſts being

equall

equall with God, from *Joh.* 5. 18. & *Phil.* 2. 6. hath been already removed, and the places fully vindicated. They proceed.

But where is it that Christ is called the Sonne of the Living God, the proper and only begotten Sonne of God?

Mat. 16. 16. Rom. 8. 32. Joh. 3. 16, 18.

But how are these places answered?

"From all these Attributes of Christ a divine "nature can by no meanes be proved. For as to "the first, it is notorious that *Peter* confessed that "the Son of man was Christ, and the Son of the "Living God, who as it is evident, had not such a "divine nature as they feigne. Besides, the Scripture "testifyeth of other men, that they are the Sons "of the Living God: as the Apostle out of *Hosea*, "*Ro.* 9 26. and as to what belongeth to the second "and third places, in them we read that the "proper and only begotten Sonne of God was "delivered to death, which cannot be said of "him who is God by nature. Yea from hence "that Christ is the Sonne of God, it appeares "that he is not God: for otherwise he should "be Sonne to himselfe. But the cause why these "Attributes belong to Christ is this, that he is "the chiefest, and most deare to God among all "the Sonnes of God: as *Isaac*, because he was "most deare to *Abraham* and was his heire is "called his only begotten sonne *Heb.* 11. 17. "although he had his brother *Ishmael*: and *Solo-*"*mon* the only begotteen of his Mother, although "he had many brethren by the same Mother: "1 *Chron.* 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. *Prov.* 4. 3.

§. 12.

Filium autem Dei viventis, filium Dei proprium & unigenitum esse Christum, ubi habetur?

De hoc Matth. 16. v. 16. *legimus, ubi Petrus ait, Tu es Christus filius Dei viventis. Et* Rom. 8. v. 32. *ubi Apostolus ait; Qui (Deus) proprio filio non pepercit, verum eum propter nos tradidit. Et* Joan. 3. 16. *Sic Deus dilexit mundum, ut filium suum unigenitum daret. Et* v. 18. *nomen unigeniti filii Dei.*

Quomodo verò ad hæc loca respondetur?

Ex iis omnibus attributis Christi nullo modo probari posse naturam ejus divinam. Nam quod ad primum attinet, notissimum est Petrum fateri, quod filius hominis sit Christus, & filius Dei viventis, quem constat divinam naturam, qualem illi comminiscuntur, non habuisse; præterea, testatur Scriptura de aliis hominibus quod sint filii Dei viventis, ut ex Hosea, Rom. 9. v. 26. *Et erit loco ejus, ubi iis dictum est; non populus meus (estis) vos; illic vocabuntur filii Dei viventis. Quod vero secundum & tertium locum attinet, in his legimus proprium & unigenitum Dei filium in mortem traditum, quod de eo, qui natura deus sit, dici non potest. Imo vero ex eo, quod Christus dei Filius sit, apparet deum illum non esse, alioquin sibi ipsi Filius esset. Causa vero cur Christo ista Attributa competant, hæc est, quod inter omnes dei Filios & præcipuus sit, & deo charissimus, quemadmodum Isaac, quia Abrahamo charissimus & hæres exstitit, unigenitus vocatus est.* Heb. 11. 17. *licet fratrem Ismaelem habuerit: & Solomon unigenitus coram matre sua, licet plures ex eadem matre fratres fuerint.* 1 Paral. 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, &c. Prov 4. 3.

§. 13. I have spoken before *fully* to all these places, and therefore shall be very briefe in the vindication of them in this place. On what account Christ *is*, and on what account alone He *is called the Sonne of God*, hath been sufficiently demonstrated: and his unity of nature with his Father thence evinced. It is true 1. That *Peter* calls Christ, who was the *Sonne of man*, the *Sonne of the living God*. Not *in* that, or *on* that account whereon he is the *Sonne of man*, but because he is peculiarly in respect of another nature, then that wherein he is the *Sonne of man*, the Sonne of the *Living God*. And if *Peter* had intended no more in this Assertion, but only that he was *one* among the *many* Sonnes of God, How doth he answer that *Question*, but whom say *ye* that I am? being exceptive to what others said, who yet affirmed that he was a *Prophet*, one *come out from God*, and favoured of him. It is evident, that it is something much more *noble* and *divine* that is here affirmed by him, in this solemne confession of him, on whom the Church is built. It is true, Believers are called *Children of the living God*, *Rom.* 9. 26. in opposition to the *Idols* whom they served before their Conversion; neither doe we argue from this expression barely, of the *Living God*, but in conjunction with those other that follow, and in the *Emphaticalnesse* of it, in this confession of *Peter*, Christ instantly affirming that this was a *Rocke*, which should not be prevailed against. 2. What is meant by the *proper and only begotten Sonne of God* hath been already abundantly evinced; nor is it disproved by saying, *that the proper and only Sonne of God was given to death*; for so he was, and thereby God redeemed his *Church with his own blood*. He that is the *proper and only begotten* Sonne of God, was given to death, though not in that nature, and in respect of that wherein he is the *proper and only begotten Son of God*. 3. Christ is the *Sonne of the Father*, who is God, and therein the *Sonne of God*, without any danger of being the *Sonne of himselfe*, that is, of God as he is the Sonne. This is a *begging* the thing in question, without offering any plea for what they pretend to, but their own unbeliefe, and carnall apprehensions of the things of God. 4. Our *Catechists* have exceedingly forgotten themselves, and their *Masters*, in affirming, that Christ is called the *proper and only begotten Sonne of God*, because he is most *deare* to God of all his Sonnes; themselves and their *Master* having as

was

was shewed at large before, given us reasons quite of another nature for this appellation, which we have discussed & disproved elsewhere. 5. If Christ be the *only begotten Sonne of God*, only on this account, because he is most *deare among all the Sonnes of God*, then He is the Sonne of God upon the same account with them; that is, *by Regeneration and Adoption*; which that it is most false hath been shewed elsewhere. Christ is the *proper, naturall, only begotten Sonne of God*, in contradistinction to all others, the *Adopted* Sonnes of God, as was wade manifest. *Isaac* is called the *only begotten* Sonne of *Abraham*, not absolutely, but in reference to the *Promise*: He was his *only begotten Sonne* to whom the Promise did belong: *He that received the promise offered up his only begotten Sonne. Solomon* is not said to be the *only begotten* of his Mother, *Prov.* 4. 3. but only *before the face*, or *in the sight* of his Mother; eminently expressing his preferment as to her *Affections*. How little is this to what the Gospell sayes of Jesus Christ?

§. 14. I have only to say concerning *Grotius* in this mater; that from none of these Expressions in any place, doth he take the least notice of what is necessarily concluded concerning the Deity of Christ, wherein he might use his own liberty. The opening, interpretation, & improvement of these Testimonies to the end aymed at, I desire the Reader to see *C.* 7. They proceed.

§. 15. *What Scripture calls Christ the first borne of every Creature?*

Col. 1. 15.

What dost thou Answer thereunto?

"Neither can it hence be gathered that Christ "hath a divine Nature: for seeing Christ is the "first borne of every Creature, it is necessary that "he be one of the number of the Creatures. For "that is the force of the word first borne in the "Scriptures, that it is of necessity, that he who is "first borne, be one of the number of them of "whom he is the first borne: *Col.* 1. 18. *Rom.* 8. "29. *Apoc.* 1. 5. Neither that our Lord Jesus was "one of the things created in the old Creation, "can our Adversaries grant, unless they will be "Arians: it behoveth them that they grant

Quæ Scriptura eum vocat, Primo genitum omnis creaturæ?

Col. 1. 15.

Quid ad eam respondes?

Neq; hinc naturam divinam Christum habere ex sculpi posse: Etenim cum Christus primogenitus omnis creaturæ sit, eum unum e numero creaturarum esse oportere, necesse est. Ea enim in Scripturis vis est primogeniti ut primogenitum unum ex eorum genere quorum primogenitus est, esse, necesse sit. Col. 1. 18. Rom. 8. 29. Apoc. 1. 5. *Ut vero unus e rebus conditis creati-*

"him to be one of the new Creation. From "whence not only the divine nature of Christ can- "not be proved, but also that Christ hath no "such Divine nature is firmely evinced. But now "that Jesus is called by that name, by the Apostle "it is from hence, that in time & worth he far ex- "ceedeth all other things of the new Creation.

onis veteris existat dominus Jesus, nec Adversarii quidem concedent nisi Ariani esse velint. Unum igitur esse e novæ creationis genere dominum Jesum concedant oportet. Unde non solum divina Christi natura effici non potest; verum etiam quod nullam divinam naturam Christus habeat, firmiter conficitur. Quod vero eo nomine vocatur ab Apostolo Jesus, eo fit, quod tempore & præstantia res omnes novæ creationis longe antecedat.

§. 16. That by the *Creation*, in this verse, and the things annumerated to be created in the verses following, is intended the *Creation of the world*, and all things therein visible, & invisible, was before abundantly evinced, in the consideration of the ensuing verses, & the exceptions of these *Catechists* wholy removed, from being any hinderance to the embracing of the first obvious *sence* of the words. All then that is here infer'd from a supposition of the *new Creation* being here intended, (which is a most *vaine supposition*) falls to the *ground* of it selfe: So that I shall not need to take the least farther notice of it. 2. That Christ is so the *first borne of the old Creation*, as to be a Prince, Heire, and Lord of it, and the things thereof, which is the sence of the word as here used & yet not one of them is evident from the Context: The very next words to these, *He is the first borne of every Creature*, are, *and by him all things were created*. He by whom all things, all Creatures were Created, is no Creature; for he else must create himselfe. And so we are neither *Arians*, nor *Photinians*: Though the former have more colour of saving themselves from the sword of the word, then the latter, yet they both perish by it. 3. The word πρωτοτοκος *first borne*, in this place is *Metaphorical*: and the expression is intended to set out the excellency of Christ above all other things. That that is the designe of the Holy Ghost in the place, is confessed. Now whereas the word may import two things concerning him of whom it is spoken; First that he is one of them in reference to whom He is said to be the *first borne*: Or 2. that he hath *Priviledge, Preheminence, Rule, and inheritance* of them and over them; I aske which of these significations suits the Apostles ayme here, to set out the Excellency of Christ, above all Creatures; that which

which makes him *one* of them, or that which exalts him *above* them. 4. Πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, is, *begotten before* all creatures, or every creature. The Apostle doth not say, Christ was πρῶτος κτισθείς, the first of them made, but he was borne or begotten before them all, that is, from eternity. His being begotten, is opposed to the creation of all other things. And though the word, where expresse mention is made of others, in the same kind, may denote *one* of them, yet where it is used concerning things so far distant, & which are not *compared*, but *one* preferred above the *other*, it requires no such signification. See *Job.* 18.13. *Ps.*89.27. *Jer.*31.9. *Grotius* is perfectly agreed with our *Catechists*, and uses their very words in the exposition of this place; but that also hath been considered, and his expositions called to an account formerly.

The next Testimonies insisted on they produce in answer to this question. §. 17.

What Scriptures affirme, that Christ hath all things that the Father hath?

Joh. 16. 15. Joh. 17. 10.

What saist thou to these?

"We have above declared, that the word "*omnia*, all things, is almost allwayes referred to "the subject matter. wherefore from these pla- "ces that which they intend can no way be "proved. The subject matter Chap. 16. is that "which the Holy Spirit was to reveale to the "Apostles, which belonged to the Kingdome of "Christ. And Chap. 17. it is most apparent "that he treateth of his Disciples, whom God "gave him, whom he calls his. Moreover seeing "that whatever Christ hath, He hath it by gift "from the Father, and not of himselfe, it hence "appeareth, that he can by no meanes have a di- "vine nature, when he who is God by nature "hath all things of himselfe.

Vbi vero Scriptura eum omnia, quæ Pater habeat, habere asserit?

Joan. 16. v. 15. *Christus ait Omnia, quæ Pater habet, mea sunt, & infra capite* 17. 10. *Mea omnia tua sunt, & tua mea.*

Quid tu ad hæc?

Vox omnia ad subjectam materiam ut superius aliquoties demonstravimus fere semper refertur. Quare ex ejusmodi locis non potest ullo modo, quod volunt, effici. Materia vero subjecta cap. 16. *est, id nimirum, quod Spiritus Sanctus Apostolis ad Christi regnum spectans revelaturus erat. Et* 17. cap. *constat apertissime agi de discipulis ipsius Jesu quos ipsi deus dederat, unde eos etiam suos vocat. Praterea, cum quicquid Christus habeat, habeat Patris dono, non autem a seipso, hinc apparet, ipsum Divinam naturam habere nullo modo posse, cum natura Deus omnia a seipso habeat.*

Of

§. 18. Of these texts the consideration will soon be dispatched. *Joh.* 16.15. Christ saith; *All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore said I he shall take of mine, and shew it unto you.* Now if all things that the Father hath, are his, then the *Divine nature is his*, for the Father hath a *divine nature*. But they say, this *All things, is to be expounded according to the subject matter treated of*, that is, only what the Holy Ghost was to reveale to the Apostles. Let thē the expression be expounded according to the *subject matter*. Christ renders a Reason why he said that the Spirit should *take of his*, even because what he had of the Father, He had also of him; all that the Father hath being his. Now it was the *knowledge of all truth*, and all things to come, and all things concerning the Kingdome of Christ, that he was thus to shew to the Apostles. But looke whence the Holy Ghost hath his knowledge, thence he hath his *Essence*: For those things doe not really differ in a divine nature. The Spirit then having his *knowledge* of the *Son*, hath also his *Essence* of the *Son*, as he hath of the Father. And by this it is most evidently *confirmed*, that among the *all things* that the Father *hath*, which the Son *hath*, his Divine nature is also; or else that could be no reason why he should say that the Spirit *should take of his, and shew to them.*

§. 19. 2. *Joh.* 17.10. A Reason is rendred why those who are Christs, are also Gods, and to be in his care; that is, because *all his things* (τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα) *were the Fathers, and all the Fathers his.* It is not then spoken of the *Disciples*, but a Reason given why the *Disciples* are so in the love of God, because of the *unity of Essence* which is between Father and Sonne, whence all the Sonnes things are the Fathers, and all the Fathers are the Sonnes.

§. 20. 3. Christs having *all things* not from himselfe, but by *gift* from the Father, may be understood two wayes. Either it referres to the *nature* of Christ, as he is God, or to the *Person* of Christ, as he is the Son of God. In the first sence it is false; for the nature of Christ being one with that of the Father, hath all things without Concession, *gift*, or *grant* made to it, as the *nature*: but as the *Person* of the Sonne, in which regard he receives all things, *even his nature* from the Father, so it is true: (those words being expounded as above) but this only proves him to be the *Sonne of God*, not at all that He is not God.

Grotius

Grotius on the first place, πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμά ἐστι: *etiam præscientia & decreta de rebus futuris, quatenus ecclesiam spectant.* Did he truly intend what the first words do import, we should judge our selves not a little beholding to him. The *Foreknowledge* of God is not in any, who is not God: nor his *decrees*: The first is an *Eternall property* of his nature: The latter are Eternall Acts of his will. If Christ have these, He must have the nature of God; But the *last* words evidently take away what the *first* seeme to grant, by restraining this participation of Christ, in the foreknowledge & Decrees of God, to things *concerning the Church*, in which sence *Socinus* grants the knowledge of Christ to be *infinite*, namely in respect of the Church. *Disput. de Adorat. Christi. cap. Christiano Francken* p. 15. But it being certaine, that he whose the *Prescience* of God, & his *purposes* are properly, as to any *one* thing, his they are *universally*; it is *too evident*, that he intends these things to belong to Christ, no otherwise, but as God revealeth the things that are to come concerning his Church to him, which respects his *Office* as Mediatour, not his nature, as he is one with God blessed for ever. Of the Deity of Christ neither in this, nor the other place, is there the least intimation in that Authour. §. 21.

§. 22.

But what Scripture calleth Christ the Eternall Father?

Isaiah 9. 6.

What sayst thou thereunto?

"From thence a Divine nature cannot be pro-
"ved, seeing Christ is called the Father of Eter-
"nity for a certaine cause, as may be seen from
"the words there a little before expressed. But it
"is marvelous, that the Adversaries will referre
"this place to the Sonne, which treats of the E-
"ternall Father, who, as it is evident according
"to themselves, is not the Father. But Christ is
"said to be the Father of Eternity, or of the
"world to come, because he is the Prince and
"Author of Eternall life, which is future.

At quæ Scriptura Christum Patrem Æternitatis vocat?

Isaiæ 9. v. 6.

Tu vero quid ad hæc.

Ex eo naturam divinam probari non posse, cum certam ob causam Pater æternitatis Christus sit vocatus, ex ipsis verbis ibidem paulo superius expressis, videre est. Mirum vero est, Adversarios hunc locum, ubi igitur de patre æterno, ad filium referre, quem constat secundum eos ipsos patrem non esse. Pater vero æternitatis aut futuri seculi propterea dictus est Christus, quod sit princeps & Autor vitæ æternæ, quæ futura est.

It were well for our Adversaries if they could thus shitt off this Testimony. Let the words be considered, and it will quickly appeare, what need they have of other helps, if they intend to escape this Sword, that is *furbished* against them, and §. 23.

their cause. The words of the verse are: *For unto us a Child is borne, unto us a Sonne is given, and the Goverment shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called Wonderfull, Councellour, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.*

§. 24. Our Catechists confessing that this is spoken of Christ, and that he is here called the *Everlasting Father*, (they are more modest then *Grotius*, whose labour to corrupt this place, is to be bewayled; having ventured on the words, as farre as any of the *moderne Rabbines*, who yet make it their businesse to divert this Text from being applyed to the *Messiah*,) have saved me the labour of proving from the *Text* and *Context*, that he only can possibly be intended. This then being taken for granted: this is that which is here affirmed of him, that his *name shall be called*, or He *shall be*, & *shall be known to be* (for both these are contained in this expression) *Wonderfull, Councellour, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.* He who is the *mighty God*, & the *Everlasting Father*, is God by nature; but so is Jesus Christ. The expression here used of the *Mighty God*, is ascribed to *God*, *Deut.* 10. 17. *Nehem.* 9. 32. *Jerem.* 32. 18. and is a most eminent name of God; a name discriminating him from all that are *not God* by nature. And this may be added to the other names of God, that are attributed to Christ: as *Adonai*, *Psal.* 110. 1. *Elohim*, *Psal.* 46. 5. *Heb.* 1. 8. *Jehovah*, *Jerem.* 23. 6. *Chap.* 33. 16. *Mal.* 3. 1. *Psal.* 83. 18. *God*, *Joh.* 1. 1. *The true God*, 1 *Joh.* 5. 20. *The great God*, *Tit.* 2. 13. (of which places before) and here the *Mighty God*, the *Eternall Father*.

§. 25. 2. What say our *Catechists* to all this; they fix only on that expression, the *Eternall Father*; and say that we cannot intend the *Sonne here, because we say, he is not the Father*; and yet so do these *Gentlemen* themselves: they say Christ is the Sonne of God, and no way the same with the Father, and yet they say upon a peculiar account he is here called, the *Eternall Father*.

§. 26. 3. On what account then soever Christ is called the *Eternall Father*, yet he is called so; and *is Eternall*; whether it be, because in nature He is one with the Father, or because of his tender and *Fatherly* affections to his Church, because he is the Author of *Eternall Life*, because in him is *Life*, it is all one as to the Testimony to his Deity in the words produced. He who is the *Mighty*

Mighty God, the *Eternall Father*, the *Prince of Peace*, is God by nature, which was to be confirmed.

So much for them. But our other *Friend*, must not be forgotten. The place is of great importance. The Testimony in it, *evident* & *cleare*. & we must not suffer our selves on any pretence to be deprived of the suport thereof. Thus then he proceeds in the Exposition of this place. §. 27.

For unto us a Child is borne, *id est, nascetur, nam Hebræa præterita sumuntur pro futuris*: i. e. *shall be borne &c.* of this we shall have use in the very next words. §. 28.

Unto us a Sonne is given.] *dabitur. Ezechias patri Achazo multum dissimilis. Sic tamen ut multo excellentius hæc ad Messiam pertinere, non Christiani tantum agnoscunt, sed & Chaldæus hoc loco.* i. e. *Shall be given: Ezechiah most unlike his Father Ahaz. Yet so that these things belong more excellently to the Messiah, not only as the Christians acknowledge; but the Chaldee in this place.* §. 29.

Here begins the exposition. *Hezekiah* is intended. So indeed say some of the *Rabbins*. But 1. This prophesy is evidently a continuance of that which is begun c. 7. & was given at the time of the invasion of *Judah* by *Rezin*, and *Pekah*; which was after *Ahaz* had raigned some years; as is evident, 2 *King.* 16. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Now he raigned but 16. yeares in all; and when *Hezekiah* came to the Crown in succession to him he was 25. *yeares of age:* 2 *Kin.* 18. so that he must needs be borne before this Prophesy; there is then already an inconsistency in these Annotations; making the Prophet to speake of that which was past as future and to come. §. 30.

2. It is true, that the *Chaldee* Paraphrast applyes this Prophesy unto the *Messiah*, whose words are. *Dicit propheta Domui David; Quoniam parvulus natus est nobis, Filius datus est nobis, & suscepit legem super se, ut servaret eam; & vocabitur nomen ejus, a facie admirabilis consilii Deus, vir permanens in æternum: Christus cujus pax multiplicabitur super nos in diebus ejus.* He not only referrs the whole to *Christ*, without any intimation of *Hezekiah*, but says also, that his name shall be, the *God of Counsell*. §. 31.

3. Neither is he alone; but the antient *Rabbins* generally are of the same Judgement, as *Petrus Galatinus*, and *Raymundus Martinus* abundantly manifest. To repeat what is, or may be §. 32.

collected from them to that purpose, is not much to mine.

§. 33. 4. The present difference between us and the *learned Annotatour* is, whether *Hezekiah* be here intended at all or no: to what hath been spoken, we have that to adde in opposition to him, which we chiefely insist upon, namely, that none of the things ascribed to the person here spoken of, can be attributed to *Hezekiah*, as expressing somewhat more Divine then can be ascribed to any meer man whatever. Indeed as *Grotius* wrests the words in his following interpretation, they may be ascribed to any other; for he leaves no name of God, nor any expression of any thing Divine, to him that is spoken of.

§. 34. Among the *Rabbins* that interpret this place of *Hezekiah*, one of the chiefe said he was the *Messiah* indeed; and that they were to look for no other: This is the judgement of *Rabbi Hillel* in the *Talmud*. Hence because *Maimonides* said somewhere, that the faith of the *Messiah to come is the foundation of the Law*; It is disputed by *Rabbi Joseph Albo*, *Orat.* 1. *cap.* 1. Whether *Hillel* were not to be reckoned among the *Apostates*, and such as should have no portion *in the World to come*: but he resolves the question on *Hillel's* side, and denies that the faith of the *Messiah* to come, is the *foundation of the Law*. Others who apply these words to *Hezekiah*, say he should have been the *Messiah*, but that God altered his purpose, upon the account which they assigne: this they prove from v. 7. where in the word לְמַרְבֶּה v. 7. *mem clausum* is put in the middle of a word. This *Grotius* takes notice of v. 7. and saies, *eo stabilitatem significari volunt Hebræi, ut per mem apertum in fine rupturam*: perhaps sometimes they do so; but here some of them turne it to another purpose; as they may use it to what purpose they please: the observation being *ludicrous*. The words of *Rabbi Tanchum, in libro Sanhedrim* to this purpose are; *Dixit Rabbi Tanchum, quomodo omne mem, quod est in medio vocis, apertum est, & istud* לְמַרְבֶּה *Esa.* 9. 7. *clausum est? Quæsivit Deus sanctus benedictus facere Hezekiam Messiam, & Senacheribum Gog & Magog. Dixit proprietas judicii coram eo, domine mundi, & quid Davidem, qui dixit faciei tuæ tot cantica, & laudes, non feciſti Messiam, Ezechiam vero, cui feciſti omnia signa hæc, & non dixit canticum faciei tuæ, vis facere Messiam? Propterea clausum fuit statim, &c. Egres-*

sa

sa est vox cœlestis, secretum meum mihi. "Rabbi *Tanchum* said, see-
"ing every *mem* that is in the middle of a word is open, how
"comes that in למרבה to be closed? The holy blessed God
"sought to make *Hezekiah* to be the Messiah, and *Senacherib* to
"be *Gog* and *Magog*: propriety of judgement (that is, the right
measure of judgement) "said before him, Lord of the whole
"earth, why didst thou not make *David* Messiah, who spake
"so many Songs and Praises before thee? and wilt make *He-*
"*zekiah* to be the Messiah, for whom thou hast wrought those
"great signes, and he spake no song before thee? instantly
"*mem* was shut, and an heavenly voyce went forth, my secret
"belongs to me.

And so *Hezekiah* lost the Messiahship for want of a *Song*. §. 35.
And these are *good Masters* in the Interpretation of Prophesies concerning *Christ*. I wholly assent to the conjecture of the learned *Annotator* about this businesse: *Non incredibile est* (saies he) *quod unus scriba properans commiserat, id alios superstitiose imitatos.* "One began this writing by negligence, and others followed "him with superstition. The conjectures of some *Christians* from hence are with me of no more weight then those of the Jews: as that by this *mem clausum* is signified the birth of Christ of a Virgin; and whereas, in number it signifies 600, it denotes the space of time at the End whereof Christ was to be borne; which was so many years from the fourth of *Ahaz*, wherein this Prophesy as is supposed was given.

I have not insisted on these things, as though they were of §. 36.
any importance, or in themselves worthy to be repeated, where men are dealing seriously about the things of God; but only to shew what little cause *Grotius* had to follow the *modern Rabbins* in their Exposition of this place; whose conceits upon it are so foolish and ridiculous.

Returne we to the *Annotations*, the first passage he fixes on is; §. 37.
And the Government shall be on his shoulder; saith he, *id est, erit* μεφυεγκιν Θ. *ab ipsis cunis purpuram feret regiam, ut in regnum natus*; confer Ezech. 28. 13. *He shall be borne to Purple: From his very cradle he shall beare the Kingly Purple, being borne to the Kingdome.*

But this is nothing peculiar to *Hezekiah*; his sonne *Menassah* §. 38.
was all this as well as He. And how this being in it selfe a light

and triviall thing, common to all other Kings sonnes with him, should be thus Propheſyed of as an eminent Honour and Glory, none can see any cause. 2. But is this indeed the meaning of these words? *Hezekiah when he is a boy shall weare a purple Coat*; which the Prophet when he gave forth this Propheſy, perhaps saw him playing in every day. Certainely it is a sad thing to be forsaken of God, and to be given up to a mans own understanding, in the exposition of the Scripture. That the *Goverment*, the *Principality* here mentioned, which is said to be upon the *shoulder* of him, concerning whom the words are spoken, that is cõmitted to him, as a weighty thing, is the whole *Rule* & *Goverment* of the Church of God, committed to the mannagement of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediatour, to the unconceivable benefit and consolation of his People, the Reader may find evinced in all expositours on the place; (unlesse some *one* or other of late; Persons of no note, who to appeare *somebodys* have ventured to follow *Grotius*) it is not my businesse to insist on particulars.

§. 39. His next note is on these words; *His name shall be called. In Hæbræo est vocabit. Supple quisq; . Etiam Chaldæus vocabitur transtulit. Notum autem Hæbræis dici sic vel sic vocari aliquem cui tales Tituli aut ὀνόματα conveniunt.* I delight not to contend at all, nor shall do it, without great cause. For the sence of these words I am content, that we take up thus much: the Titles following are his names; & they agree to him; that is, He is, or shall be such an one, as answers the description in them given of him. But here our Great Doctors, whom this great man followes are divided. Some of them not seeing how it is possible that the names following should be ascribed to *Hezekiah*, some of them directly terming him God, they pervert the words, and read them thus; *The Wonderfull, Councellour, the mighty God &c. shall call his name, the Prince of Peace*; so ascribing the last name only to *Hezekiah*, all the former to God. The advantage they take is from the want of variation by *cases* in the *Hebrew*. And this way go all the present *Rabbins*, being set into it by *Solomon Jarchi*, on the place. But as this is expresly contrary to the Judgement of the old *Doctors*, as hath been abundantly proved out of their *Targum* and *Talmud*, where *Ezekiah* is called the Lord of eight names, and is opposed to *Senacherib*, who they say had eight names

Vid. Pet. Gal. lib. 3. cap. 19. Raymun. Martin. 3 p. Dist. 1. cap. 9.

names also; So it is contrary to all their own Rules of Grammer, to place the name of *Him* who calls, after the verbe *calling*, of which there is not one instance to be given. *Grotius* therefore takes in with them, who apply all these names to *Hezekiah*: shift with them afterwards as well as he can. So he proceeds.

Wonderfull: ob summas quæ in eo erunt virtutes. For the excellent virtues that shall be in him. But I pray why more then *David*, or *Josiah*? This is his *name Wonderfull*, that is, he shall be very *vertuous*, & men shall admire him: How much better this name agrees to him, & how much more proper it is, whose Person is so *great a Mystery* 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. & whose *name* is so abstruse, *Prov.* 30. 4. & that upon the wonderfull conjunction of two natures in one person here mentioned, (he who is the *Mighty God*, being also a Child given unto us) is evident to all. §. 40.

Councellor, the Mighty God: imo consultator Dei fortis. id est, qui in omnibus negotiis consilia a Deo poscet, per Prophetas scilicet, ut jam sequetur. Yea he who taketh Councell of the Mighty God: that is, who in all his affaires asks Councell of God, namely by the Prophets. §. 41.

And is not this boldnesse thus to correct the Text: Counsellor, the mighty God; yea He that *asketh Counsell of the mighty God.* What colour, what Pretence, what Reason or Plea, may be used for this perverting the words of the Text, our Annotator not in the least intimates. §. 42.

The words are evidently *belonging* to the same Person, equally parts of that *Name*, whereby he is to be called, and the casting of them without any cause into this construction, in a matter of this importance (because it is to be said) is *intollerable boldnesse.* It is not without great probability of Truth pleaded by some, that the two first words should go together, the *Wonderfull Counsellor*, as those that follow do; not that פלא *admirabilis*, is an *Epithete*, or an *Adjective*, it being a *Substantive*, and signifying a *Wonder* or a *Miracle*, but that the weight of what is said, being laid much upon the force of *Counsellor*, setting out the infinite Wisdome of Christ, in all his waies, purposes, and Counsells concerning his Church, this other terme seems to be suited to the setting forth thereof. But this corruption of the Text is the more intolerable in our *Annotatour*, because in the close of his Observations on this place, he confesses, that all the things

things here mentioned have a *signification* in Christ, much more sublime and plaine, then that which he hath insisted on; so that had he been any friend to the *Deity of Christ*, he would not have endeavoured to have robbed him of his *Proper name*, the *Mighty God*, in this place; but this was necessary, that the *Rabbinicall* accommodation of this place to *Hezekiah* might be retained. That this *place* then is spoken of Christ we have evinced, nor can it be waved without open perverting of the words; and he is here called the *Mighty God*, as was before declared.

§. 43. *Grotius* proceeds to apply the Residue of this Glorious name to *Hezekiah*, *The Everlasting Father*; or as it is in the vulgar Latine, *Pater futuri seculi*; *In Hebræo non est futuri*; *Pater seculi est, qui multos post se relicturus sit posteros, & in longum tempus.* "In the Hebrew the "word *future* is not; the Father of the Age, is he who leaves "many of his posterity behind him, and that for a long time.

§. 44. About the *vulgar Latine Translation* we do not contend. Of the meaning and use of the word *Gnolam* I have spoken already; Psal. 48, 14. when it is applyed to God, it signifies *Eternity*; but the word Psal. 9. 6, 7. &c. here is not *Gnolam*, but עד properly Eternity when applyed to God, *Psal.* 10. 16. God is King, עולם ועד *seculi & æternitatis*, *for ever and ever*; Instances might be multiplied to this purpose. That this should be, *Hezekiah* shall leave many Children, and that for a long season, *credat Apella*; what sonnes he left, besides *one*, and he a wicked one for the most part of his daies, is uncertaine; within an 130 years, or thereabout, his whole posterity was carried Captive; how exceedingly unsuited this appellation is to him, is evident. The Father of Eternity, that is, one that leaves a Son behind him, & a *possibility* for his *posterity* to continue in the condition wherein he was for an 130 *years*; *many* such Everlasting Fathers may we find out; what in all this is peculiar to *Hezekiah*, that this should so *emphatically* be said to be his Name?

The next is, *Princeps Pacis*, the Prince of Peace. *Princeps Pacificus, & in pace victurus.* A peaceable Prince, and one that should live in Peace.

§ 45. 1. On how much better, more Noble, and Glorious account this Title belongs to Christ, is known. 2. The *Prince of Peace*, is not a peaceable Prince, but the *Author*, Giver, Procurer, Establisher of Peace. 3. Neither did *Hezekiah* Raigne in Peace all his

his daies; His Kingdome was *invaded*, his fenced Citties taken, and himselfe and cheife Cittie delivered by a miraculous slaughter of his enemies.

Of the encrease of his Government, and of Peace no end. Which he reads according to the vulgar Latine; *Multiplicabitur ejus imperium, & Pacis ejus non erit finis. Literally, for the multiplying of his Kingdome, and of Peace no end*; As to the first part, his exposition is; *id est, durabit per annos 29. His Kingdome shall continue for 29 years.* Who would believe such grosse darkneſſe should cover the face of so Learned a man, Of the increase of his Government there shall be no end; that is, *He shall raigne nine and twenty years.* This might almost twice as properly be spoken of his sonne *Manasses*, who raigned 55. And now let him that hath a mind to feed on such *husks* as these, go on with his Annotations in this place. I am weary of considering such trash. And let the pious Reader tremble at the Righteous Judgement of God, giving up men trusting to their own Learning and abilities, refusing to captivate their hearts to the obedience of the truth, to such *foolish* and *childish imaginations*, as men of common sence must needs abhorre. §. 45

It appears then that we have here a description of Jesus Christ, and of him only; and that the names here ascribed to him, are proper to him, and declare who he was, and is, even *the mighty God, the Prince of Peace; &c.* Let us proceed with our *Catechists*. §. 46.

In the next place they heap up sundry places, which they returne *slight* Answers unto; and yet to provide them in such manner, as that they might be the easier dealt withall, they cut off *parcells*, and Expressions in the middle of sentences, and from the *Context*, from whence the greatest evidence, as to the Testimony they give in this matter, doth arise. I shall consider them apart as they are proposed. §. 47.

1. Christ is called the Word of God, *Joh.* 1.1. *Revel.* 19.13. They say. §. 48.

"From hence that Christ is called the Word "of God, a divine nature in Christ cannot be "proved, yea the contrary may be gathered. For "seeing He is the Word of the One God, it is ap- "parent, that He is not that one God. But Jesus

Ex eo, quod verbum Dei sit Christus dicitur divina in Christo natura non posse, imo adversum potius colligitur. Cum enim ipsius unius Dei verbum sit, apparet eum non

esse ipsum unum Deum. Quod etiam ad singula hæc testimonia simul responderi potest. Verbum vero, vel sermo Dei Jesus ideo nuncupatur, quod omnem Dei voluntatem nobis exposuerit, ut ibidem Johannes *inferius exposuit*, Joan. 1. 18. *Quemadmodum etiam eodem sensu & vita & veritas dicitur.*

" is therefore called the Word of God, because " He expounds to us the whole will of God, as " *John* there declares a little after, *Ioh.* 1. 18. as " He is also in the same sence said to be life and " Truth.

§. 49. Christ is the *Word* of God; the Word or ὁ λόγος, is either προφορικὸς, or the Word which outwardly is spoken of God: or ἐνδιάθετος, his Eternall *Essentiall* Word, or wisdome. Let our *Catechists* prove another acceptation of the Word in any place. That Christ is not the *Word* spoken by God, they will grant, for He was a *Person* that revealed to us the word of God. He is then Gods *Eternall Word*, or Wisdome, and so consequently God. 2. Christ is so called the *Word* of God, (*Ioh.* 1.1.) as that He is in the same place said *to be God.* And our Adversaries are indeed *too impudent*, whereas they say, *if He be the word of the one God, He cannot be the One God*; the Holy Ghost affirming the flat contrary, namely, that He *was the Word, and was with God, and was God:* that is doubtlesse the one true God, v. 1, 2, 3. He *was with God*, in his Person, as the Son, and He was God as to his nature. 3. Christ is not called the *Word*, *Ioh.* 1. 1. upon the account of his actuall revealing the word of God to us, in his own Person on the Earth, (which He did v. 18.) because he is called so in his everlasting *residence* with the Father, before the World was, v. 1. Nor is He so called on that account, *Revel.* 19. 13. it being applied to him, in reference to the *worke of executing Judgement* on his enemies, as a *King*, and not his revealing the word of God, as a *Prophet*. So that notwithstanding this Exception, this name of the *Word of God*, applied to Christ, as in the places mentioned, proves him to have a *divine nature*, and to be God blessed for ever.

§. 50. The next place is *Col.* 1. 15. *Christ is the Image of the Invisible God.* To which they say only;

Hoc idem dici potest de eo, quod imago Dei conspicui vocatur.

The same may be said of this, as of that foregoing. But,

An

An *Image* is either an *Essentiall* Image, or Accidentall. A Representation of *a* thing in the *same substance* with it, as a Sonne is the Image of his Father, or a Representation in some *resemblance* like that of a Picture. That Christ cannot be the latter is evident. Our *Catechists* referre it to his office, not his Person. But 1. It is the *Person* of Christ, that is described in that, and the following verses, and not his *Office*. 2. The Title given to God, whose Image he is, the *invisible God*, will allow there be no Image of him but what is *invisible*; nor is there any Reason of adding that *Epithite* of God, but to declare also the *invisible* Spirituall nature of Christ, wherein he is like his Father. And the same is here intended with what is mentioned in the third place. §. 51.

Heb. 1. 3. *He is the expresse Image of his Person.* §. 52.

This is to be understood, that whatever God hath promised, He hath now really exhibited in Christ.

Quod vero character Hypostaseos ejus dictus sit, hoc intelligi debet; Deū quicquid nobis promisit, jam reipsa in eo exhibuisse.

Well expounded; Christ is the *Character of his Fathers person*, that is, *what God promised he exhibited in Christ*. Would not any man admire these mens *accumen*, and readinesse to interpret Scriptures? The words are part of the description of the *Person* of the Son of God: *He is the brightnesse of his Fathers Glory, and the expresse Image of his Person, upholding all things by the word of his Power*: that is, He reveales the will of God. This the Apostle had expresly affirmed *v.* 1. in *plaine* & *familiar* termes; that he should now repeat over the same thing againe in words so exceedingly insignificant of any such matter, is very strange. 2. The Apostle speakes of the *Hypostasis* of the Father, not of his *Will*: of his *subsistence*, not his *mind* to be revealed. We doe not deny, that Christ doth represent his Father to us, and is to us the expresse *image* of his Person, but antecedently hereunto, we say he is so in himselfe. *Grotius* his corruption of this whole Chapter, was before discovered, and in part removed. §. 53.

Joh. 14. 9. *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father*; is next proposed. To which they say; §. 54.

"Neither can any Divine nature be proved from "hence, for this *seeing*, cannot be spoken of the "Essence of God, which is invisible, but of the

Quod vero attinet ad dictū domini Jesu. Qui me videt videt Patrem, neq; hinc naturam divinā probari certū cuiq;

knowledge

esse potest, cum ea ratio videndi non possit de essentia dei accipi, quæ invisibilis sit prorsus, verum de cognitione eorum quæ dixit & fecit Christus.

" knowledge of the things that Christ did and " spake.

§. 55. Christ so speakes of his Father and his *Oneneſſe*, whereby he that saw *one*, saw *both*, as he describes it to be in the verse following; where he sayes, the *Father is in Him, and He in the Father*. Now that the Father is in him, and he in the Father, and that he and the Father are *one* in nature and Essence, hath been before sufficiently demonstrated. The *seeing* here intended, is that of *Faith*, whereby both Father and Sonne are *seen* unto Believers.

§. 56. Col. 2. 9. is the last in this Collection. *In whom dwelleth all the fullnesse of the God-head bodily.*

Nec illis denique verbis, quod plenitudo divinitatis in eo habitat corpopaliter probatur natura divina primum enim, vox hæc divinitas, *designare potest voluntatem dei, eamque orationem cum Apostolus opponat non personis, sed philosophiæ & Legi, hinc perspicuum est, eam de doctrina domini Iesu non de persona accipi, de hac vero voce corporaliter; quid ea notet, inferius suo loco audies.*

To this they say 1. " That this word *Divinitas*, " may signify the will of God; And seeing the " Apostle opposeth that speech not to Persons, " but to Philosophy & the Law, it is manifest, that " it is to be understood of the Doctrine, and not " of the Person of Christ. Of this word *Bodily* " thou shalt heare afterward.

§. 57. But, 1. It is not *Divinity*, but *Deity*, not θειότης but θεότης, that is here spoken of; and that not simply neither, but πλήρωμα θεότητος, *the fullnesse of the God-head*. 2. That θεότης or πλήρωμα θεότητος, is ever taken for the *Will* of God, they doe not, they cannot prove. 3. How can it be said, that the *Will of God* κατοικεῖ σωματικῶς, *doth dwell bodily* in any, or what can be the sence of that expression? Where they afterwards interpret the word *Bodily* I do not remember, when I meet with their exposition it shall be considered. 4. That the words are to be referred to the *Person* of Christ, and not his *Doctrine*, is manifest, not only from the words themselves, that will not beare any such sence, as whereunto they are wrested, but also from the Context. For not only the whole order, and *series* of words before and after, doe speake of the Person of Christ; *For in him are hid all treasures of wisdome and knowledge*, v. 3. *Him we receive*, v. 6. *In him we are built up*, v. 7. *In him we are compleat*, v. 10. *In him we*

are

are circumcised, v. 11. *With him we are buried*, v. 12. *Together with him are we quickned*, v. 13. And it was *He that was crucified for us*, v. 14, 15. but also the designe of the Holy Ghost enforces this sence; it being to discover a *fullnesse and sufficiency in Christ*, of all Grace and Wisdome, that men should not need to seek reliefe from either *Law* or *Philosophy*. The *fullnesse* of the *God-head* inhabiting in the Person of Christ substantially, He is God by nature. And of these places so farre: the three following, of *Joh.* 17. 5. 1 *Pet.* 1. 10, 11. *Joh.* 3. 13. have been in their proper places already vindicated.

§. 58. *Grotius* interprets that of *Col.* 2. 9. according to the *Analogy* of the Faith of our *Catechists*; *Christi doctrina non modo Philosophiæ sed & Legi plurimum præstat*. That πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, should be *Doctrina*, and κατοικεῖ ἐν χείρω, should make it the *Doctrine of Christ*, and σωματικῶς, should be *no man knowes what*, is but a crosse way of interpretation. And yet *Augustine* is quoted, with a saying from him to give countenance unto it; which makes me admire almost as much as at the interpretation it selfe. The words our Annotatour mentions are taken from his *Epist.* 57. *ad Dardan.* though he mentions it not. The reason will quickly appeare to any one that shall consult the place; for notwithstanding the expression here cropt off from his Discourse, he gives an interpretation of the words, utterly contrary to what this *Learned man* would here insinuate, and perfectly agreeing with that which we have now proposed.

§. 59. Our *Catechists* proceed to the consideration of sundry places where Christ is called the *only Lord*, the *Lord of Glory*: the *King of Kings*, the *Lord of Lords*; all which being Titles of the one *true God*, prove *him* to be so: and the first proposed is; *To us there is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him*, 1 Cor. 8. 6.

§. 60. A little to give light to our Argument from hence, and that the strength of it may appeare, some few observations concerning the Context, and the words themselves, will be necessary.

§. 61. 1. V. 7. The Apostle speaking of the *Heathens*, and their opinion of the *Deity*, says *there be*, that is, to them, in their apprehension, *Gods many*, and *Lords many*: that is, many supreame

Powers who are Gods and Lords. The termes of *Gods many*, and *Lords many* are not expressive of severall kinds of Deities, but of the same; whom they esteemed *Lords* they esteemed *Gods*, and so on the contrary: In opposition to this *Polutheisme* of theirs, he declares that *Christians* have but *one* God, *one* Lord; wherein if the Apostle did not intend to assert one only God unto Christians, in the different Persons of Father and Sonne, he had not spoken in such an opposition, as the *Adversative* ἀλλα at the beginning of the words, and the comparison instituted do require.

§. 62. 2. That this *one* Lord of Christians is the *only* true God, is manifest from Deut. 6.4. *The Lord our God is one Lord.* So the Apostle here; *to us there is one Lord:* not many Gods, as the Heathens fancied; in opposition also to whose *Idolatry* is that assertion of *Moses*. And so *Thomas* in his confession joynes these two together, intending one and the same Person, *my Lord, and my God.*

§. 63. 3. Κύριος, being put to signify God, is the word which the Septuagint render Jehovah by, and so εἷς κύριος, is that *only Jehovah.*

§. 64. 4. The Attribution of the *same Workes* in this verse to Father and Sonne, manifest them to be the same *one* God: *Of whom are all things, and we in him; by whom are all things, and we by him.* These things being premised, what our *Catechists* except to this Testimony may be considered: thus then they.

§. 65. "Hence a Divine nature cannot be proved; "For 1. He doth manifestly difference him from "the Father, whom we have taught above to "be the only God by nature. 2. This that it "says of him, that by him are all things, shewes "him not to be God by nature, seeing as hath "been above declared, this particle *by*, doth not "signify the first, but the second cause, which can "by no meanes be spoken of him, who is God by "nature. And though the Scriptures do some-"times say of the Father, by him are all things, "yet these words are to be taken otherwise of "the Father, then of the Sonne. It is manifest "that this is said of the Father, because all me-

Ex eo quod Christum Apostolus Dominum suum vocet, natura divina effici nequit. Nam eum primo manifeste ab illo Patre, *quem ibidem deum unum fatetur, secernit, quem solum natura deum esse superius docuimus: deinde, hoc ipsum quod de eo dicit, omnia per ipsum, eum natura deum esse non ostendit: cum ut superius demonstratum est, hac particula, per, non primam, verum secundam causam designari constet: quod de eo qui natura deus est, dici nullo modo potest.*

diate

"diate causes, by which any thing is done, are "not from any other, but from himselfe; nor are "they such, as that He cannot worke without "them: but it is spoken of Christ, because by "him, another, namely God, worketh all things, "as it is expressly said *Eph.3.9.* That I need not "to remember, that the word *all things*, as was "shewed above, is to be referred to the subject "matter. Which that it is so appeareth hence, "that the Apostle dealeth of al those things which "belong to the Christian people, as these two "words, [*to us*, and *Father*,] do declare. Whence "it is proved, that Christ is not simply and ab-"solutely, but in some certaine respect, called "the one Lord, by whom are all things. Where-"fore his Divine nature is not proved from "hence.

Et licet de patre Scriptura interdum loquatur per eum omnia, aliter tamen hæc de Patre, quam de Christo accipiuntur: de patre enim hæc ideo dici constat, quod omnes causæ mediæ per quas fit aliquid, non aliunde sint, nisi ab ipso, nec sint ejusmodi, ut sine iis ille agere non possit: de Christo vero dicuntur, quod per eum alius quis, nempe Deus omnia operetur ut Ephes. 3. 9. expresse habetur. Ne commemorandum mihi sit, verbum, omnia, (uti superius ostensum est) ad subjectam materiam referri. Quod ita habere inde apparet, quod Apostolus agit de iis omnibus rebus, quæ ad populum Christianum pertinent, ut duo hæc verba demonstrant, nobis & Pater. Vnde efficitur Christum non simpliciter & absolute, verum certa de causa vocatum Dominum unum, per quem omnia. Quare hinc natura divina non probatur.

It is very evident, that they are much entangled with this Testimony, which necessitates them to turne themselves into all manner of shapes, to try whether they can shift their bonds, and escape or no. Their severall attempts to evade shall be considered in their order, §. 66.

1. It is true, Christ is differenced clearely from the Father, as to his *Person*, here spoken of; but that they have proved the Father to be the *only God by nature*, *exclusively* to the Sonne, and Holy Ghost, is but a *boasting* before they *put off their harnesse*. It is true, the Father is said here to be the *one* God, which no more hinders the Sonne from being *so* too, then the Assertion that the Sonne is the *one* Lord, denyes the Fathers being *so* also. §. 67.

2. That cavill at the word *by*, hath been already considered, and removed. It is enough for us to manifest, that this Assignation of the Creation of *all things* to Christ, by the Expression of, *by him are all things*, doth by no meanes depose him from the honour of principall efficient Cause in that worke, the same Attribution being made to the Father in the same words. §. 68.

And

And to say as our *Catechists* do, that this Expression is ascribed to the Father, in such a sence, and not to Christ, is purely without any pretence of proofe to *begge* the thing in Question. Neither is that any thing to the purpose, which is urged from *Ephes.* 3. 9. for we confesse, that as Christ is *equall* with his Father, as to his nature, wherein He is God, so as He is the Son in *Office*, He was the *Servant* of the Father, who accomplishes his *own mind and will* by him.

§. 69. 3. The *subject matter* in this place, as to the words under consideration, is the demonstration of the *one* God, and *Lord* of *Christians*, asserted in opposition to the *many* Gods, and Lords of the *Heathen*, from the effects or works of that one God, and Lord; *from him, and by him are all things*. And this is the difference that God elsewhere puts between himselfe and Idols, *Jer.* 10. 10, 11. And if there be any such *subject matter*, as proves Christ not to be the *one* Lord absolutely, but in *some respect*, it proves also that the Father is not the *one* God absolutely, but in *some respect* only.

§. 70. 4. The words, *to us*, and *Father*, do one of them expresse the *Persons believing* the doctrine proposed, concerning the one true God and Lord, the other describes that *one* true God, by that name whereby He revealed himselfe to those Believers; neither of them at all enforcing the restriction mentioned. Christ then is absolutely the *one* Lord of Christians, who *made all things*, and so is by nature *God blessed for ever*.

§ 71. I should but needlesly multiply words particularly to animadvert on *Grotius* his *Annotations* on this place: I do it only where he seems to adde some new shifts to the Interpretation of our Adversaries, or varies from them in the *way*, though he agree in the *end*; neither of which Reasons occurring in this place, I shall not trouble the Reader with the consideration of his words. By δι' ὃ τὰ πάντα, to maintaine his former *Expositions* of the like kind, he will have *all the things of the new Creation* only intended, but without colour or pretence of proofe; or any thing to give light to such an exposition of the words.

§. 72. Our Catechists next mention, 1 *Cor.* 2. 8. *for if they had known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory.*

Who is the *Lord of Glory*, or *God of Glory*, the Holy Ghost declares, *Act*: 7. 2. The *God of Glory appeared to our Father Abraham*

when he was in Mesopotamia: & *Psal.* 24. 9. *Who is the King of Glory? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in Battell.* Christ therefore is this God; and indeed is intended in that Psalme. But they say:

§. 73.

"A Divine Nature cannot be proved from "hence, seeing it treateth of him who was Cru- "cified; which cannot be said of a Divine nature, "but of a man, who is therefore called the Lord "of Glory; that is, the Glorious Lord, because he "is Crowned of God with Glory and Honour.

Cum in eo agatur de eo qui crucifixus sit, apparet ex eo naturam divinam non probari, cum de hac illud dici nequeat, verum de homine, qui ideo dominus Gloriæ dicitur, hoc est, dominus gloriosus, quod a deo gloria & honore coronatus sit.

But,

§. 74.

1. Though the *Divine Nature* could not be Crucified, yet He that had a *Divine Nature* might be, and was *Crucified* in the nature of a Man, which He also had. Our *Catechists* know they do but *begge* in these things; and would feign have us grant, that because Christ had an *Humane* nature, He had not a *Divine*. 2. He is called the *Lord of Glory*, as God is called the *God of Glory*, and these termes are equivalent, as hath been shewed. 3. He was the *Lord of Glory* when the Jewes crucified him; or else they had not crucified *him, who was the Lord of Glory*, but *one* that was *to be so*: for He was not *Crowned with Glory and Honour*, untill after his crucifying.

§. 75.

Grotius his Annotation on this place, is worth our observation, as having somewhat *new*, and peculiar in it Κύριον τῆς δόξης, *Eum quem Deus vult esse omnium Judicem, nam Gloria Christi maximè illum diem respicit*; 1 *Pet.* 4. 13. *Christus* κατ' ἐξοχὴν δόξης, *præfiguratus per arcam, quæ* מלך הכבוד *Psal.* 24. 9. For the matter and substance of it, this is the same plea with that before mentioned; the Additions only deserve our notice: Christ is called the *Lord of Glory*, as God is called the *God of Glory*. And that terme is given him to testify, that he is the *God of Glory*. If his Glory at the day of Judgement be intended, the Jewes could not be said to crucify the *Lord of Glory*, but him that was *to be* the Lord of Glory, at the end of the World. Our participation of Christs Glory is mentioned, 1 *Pet.* 4. 13. not his obtaining of Glory. He *is Essentially* the Lord of Glory, the manifestation whereof is various, and shall be eminent at the day of judgement. 2. That the *Arke* is called מלך הכבוד is little lesse then *Blasphemy*. It is he alone who is the *Lord of Hosts*, who is called the *Lord of Glory*, *Psal.* 24.

9. But this is another shift, for the obtaining of the end designed; namely to give an instance where a *creature* is called *Jehovah*, (as that King of Glory is) then which a more unhappy one could scarce be fixed on in the whole Scripture. The Annotations of the Learned man on that whole *Psalme* are very scanty; his designe is to referre it all to the story of *Davids* bringing home the *Arke*, 2 *Sam.*6. That it might be occasioned thereby I will not deny; that the *Arke* is called the King of Glory, and the Lord of Hosts, and not He, of whose Presence and Favour, the *Arke* was a Testimony, no attempt of proofe is offered. Neither (by the way) can I assent unto his Interpretation of these words; *Lift up your heads O ye Gates, and be ye lift up yee everlasting doores*: that is, *Yee Gates of Sion, made of Cedar, that are made hanging downe, and when they are opened, they are lifted up.* Certainly something more *sublime* and Glorious is intended.

§. 76. The processe of our *Catechists* is unto *Revel.*17.14. & Chap. 19.16. in both which places Christ is called the *Lord of Lords, and King of Kings.* This also is expresly the name of God, 1 *Tim.* 6.16. *Who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords: who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light, &c.* To

§. 77. this they say.

In tertio testimonio, cum agatur de eo, qui agnus est, & qui vestimenta habet, quem & occisum, & sanguine suo nos redimisse apertissime idem Joannes fatetur, quæ referri ad divinam naturam nulla ratione possunt, apparet eo naturam divinam Christi astrui non posse. Omnia vero, quæ hic Christo in iis testimoniis tribuuntur, singularem ipsius potestatem, quam deus Christo in iis, quæ ad novum fœdus pertinent, dedit, arguunt.

"In this Testimony He is treated of who is the "Lamb, who hath garments, who was killed, and "Redeemed us with his blood, as *John* evidently "testifyeth, which can by no meanes be referred "to a Divine nature, and therefore a Divine na"ture cannot hence be proved. But all things that "in these Testimonies are attributed to Christ "do argue that singular Authority which God "hath given unto Christ, in those things that be"long to the New Covenant.

§. 78. These are but *drops*, the *showre* is past. Because he who *was the Lamb*, who was slaine, is *King of Kings and Lord of Lords*, we prove him to have another nature, in respect whereof he could be neither *killed* nor *slain*. Therefore he is God; God only is so; And the Answer is; because He was the *Lamb*, *He was killed*, *slaine*

ſlaine, therefore He is not God; that is, He is not King of Kings, & Lord of Lords, which the Holy Ghoſt, who gave him this name will prove againſt them. 2. Our Adverſaries have nothing to except againſt this Teſtimony, but that the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords is not God; which they do not prove, nor labour to diſprove our confirmation of it. 3. *Kings and Lords* of the World, are not of the things of the New Covenant, ſo that Chriſts abſolute ſoveraignty over them, is not of the grant which he hath of his Father as *Mediatour*, but as he is God by nature. And ſo much for this collection concerning theſe ſeverall Names of God Attributed to Chriſt.

§. 79. What followes in the *three* Queſtions and Anſwers enſuing, relates to the divine *Worſhip* attributed to Chriſt in the Scriptures, though it be marveilous faintly urged by them. Some few Texts are named, but ſo much as the intendment of our Argument from them is not once mentioned. But becauſe I muſt take up this elſewhere, *viz.* in Anſwer to M. *Biddle* (C. 10.) I ſhall remit the conſideration of what here they except, to the proper place of it, where God aſſiſting, from the *Divine worſhip and Invocation of Jeſus Chriſt*, I ſhall invincibly demonſtrate his *Eternall power and God-head*.

§. 80. In the laſt place, they heap up together a number of *Teſtimonies*, each of which is ſufficient to caſt them down to the ſides of the *pit*, in the middeſt of their Attempts againſt the Eternall Deity of the Sonne of God, and accommodate a ſlight generall Anſwer to them all. The places are worth the conſideration, I ſhall only propoſe them, & then conſider their Anſwer.

§. 81. The firſt is Iſ. 8. 13, 14. *Sanctify the Lord of Hoſts himſelfe, let him be your feare, & let him be your dread. And He ſhall be for a Sanctuary: but for a ſtone of ſtumbling, & a rock of offence, to both the houſes of Iſrael.* He that is to be for a *Rock of offence*, & a *ſtone of ſtumbling*, is the Lord of Hoſts, whom we muſt *ſanctify in our hearts, and make him our dread and our feare*. But this was Jeſus Chriſt: Luk. 2. 34. *This Child is ſet for the riſing and fall of many in Iſrael: As it is written, behold I lay in Sion a ſtumbling block, a rock of offence; and whoſoever believeth on him ſhall not be aſhamed*: Rom. 9. 32, 33. *the ſtone which the builders refuſed,---- and a ſtone of ſtumbling, and a rock of offence*: 1 Pet. 2. 7. In all which places that Propheſy is repeated. Chriſt

therefore is the *Lord of Hosts*, whom we are to sanctify in our heart, and to make him our *dread, and our feare.*

§. 82. Isa. 45. 22, 23. *I am the Lord, and there is none else: I have sworne by my selfe, the word is gone out of my mouth in Righteousnesse, and shall not returne, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall sweare.* He who is God, and none else, is God by nature. But now, *we must all stand before the Judgement seat of Jesus Christ, for it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confesse to God.* Rom. 14. 10, 11, 12 It is the Judgement seat of Christ, that men must appeare before, when they bow their knee to him, that is, to *him who is God, and none else.*

§. 83. Isa. 41. 4. *I Jehovah, the first, and with the last, I am he.* Chap. 44. 6. *I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God.* So Chap. 48. 12. That this is spoken of Christ we have his own Testimony, Revel. 1. 17. *Feare not, I am the first, and the last.* He who is the first and the last, He is God, and there is none, besides him.

§. 84. Zech. 12 10. *I will poure on the House of David, and upon the Inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of Grace and supplications, and they shall looke upon me whom they have pierced.* He that speakes is unquestionably Jehovah the Lord of Hosts: So the whole context, so the promising of the Spirit in this verse evinces: but that Jesus Christ is here intended, that it is He who is spoken of is evident. Rev. 1. 7. *Every eye shall see him, and they also that pierced him:* He then is *Jehovah* the Lord of Hosts. *For these things were done that the Scripture should be fulfilled, not a bone of him shall be broken. And againe, another Scripture saith they shall look one him whom they have pierced.* Joh. 19. 36, 37. It is as I said beyond dispute, that it is *Jehovah* the only true God that spake, and whathe spoke of himselfe is fulfilled in Jesus Christ.

§. 85. Psal. 68. 17. *The Chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of Angels: the Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the Holy place: Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast lead captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men, that the Lord God might dewell among them.* This also is a Glorious description of the triumphant Majesty of God; and yet the *God* here intended is Jesus Christ, *Ephes.* 4. 8, 9, 10. *Wherefore he saith, when He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive and gave gifts to men: Now that he ascended, what is it, but that he also descended*

descended first into the lower parts of the earth; He that descended is the same that ascended.

Grotius on both these places sayes; that what is *properly spoken of God*, is by *Paul mystically* applyed to Christ: to the same purpose with what our *Catechists* afterwards insist on. That it is the same person who is intended in both places, and not that *applyed* to *one*, which was *spoken* of *another* (which is most evident in the Context) He takes no notice. There being nothing of plea or Argument in his *Annotations*, against our Testimonies from hence, but only an indeavour to divert the meaning of the places to another sence, I shall not insist longer on them.

But what say our Catechists to all these, which are but some of the instances of this kind that might be given? Say they;

§. 86.

"To all these it may be so answered, as that "it may appeare, that a divine nature in Christ "cannot from them be proved. For those things "which are spoken of God under the Law, may "be spoken of Christ under the Gospell: as also "they are spoken for another cause; namely, "because of that eminent conjunction that is be-"tween God & Christ, on the account of domi-"nion, Power, and Office; all which the Scrip-"tures of the New Testament doe frequently "witnesse, that he received by gift from God. "And if the Scripture delivers this of *Moses*, that "he brought *Israel* out of *Egypt*, *Exod* 32. 7. and "that he was the Redeemer of the people; & of "others, the same things that were evidently writ-"ten of God, when neither *Moses*, nor others had "so neere a conjunction with God, as was between "God and Christ, much more justly may those "things, which in the first respect are spoken of "God, be accommodated to Christ, because of "the eminent and neere conjunction that was "between them.

Ad omnia ita responderi potest, ut appareat nullo modo ex iis effici divinam in Christo esse naturam. Etenim aliam ob causam ea, quæ de Deo dicta sunt sub Lege, dici potuerunt de Christo sub Evangelio quemadmodum & dicta sunt. Nimirum propter illam summam, quæ inter Deum & Christum est, ratione imperii, potestatis, atq; muneris, conjunctionem, quæ omnia illum Dei dono consecutum esse Scripturæ novi Testamenti passim testantur. Quod si Scriptura ea tradit de Mose, *eum Israelem ex Ægypto duxisse* Exod. 32. 7. *& quod Redemptor illius populi fuerit,* Act. 7. 35. *& de aliis idem, quod de ipso Deo apertissime Scriptum erat. Cum nec* Moses, *nec alii, tantâ cũ Deo conjunctionem haberent, quanta inter Deum & Christum intercessit, multo justius, hæc quæ de Deo primo respectu dicta sunt, Christo accommodari possunt, propter summam illam & artissimam inter Deum & Christum conjunctionem.*

§. 87. And this is their defence: the Answer they fix upon to all the Testimonies recited: wherein how little Truth or strength there is, will quickly appeare. 1. These Scriptures perhaps *may* be Answered thus or thus, as what will not the serpentine wits of men find out, to wrest the Word withall to their own destruction? But the question is, how they ought to be interpreted, and what is their sence and intendment. 2. We doe not say, that what is spoken of *God* under the Law, is *accommodated* to Christ under the Gospell; but that the things instanced in, that were spoken of *God*, were then spoken of Christ, as to his nature wherein He is God; which appeares by the event, expounded in the Bookes of the New Testament. The Scripture doth not say in the New Testament of Christ, what was said in the Old of God; but evinces those things which were so spoken of God, to have been spoken of Christ. So that 3. The folly of that pretence, that what was spoken of *God* is referred to *Christ*, upon the account of the *conjunction* mentioned, which whatever it be, is a thing of naught in comparison of the distance that is between the *Creatour* and a meere creature, is manifest; for let any one be in never so neare conjunction with God, yet if he be not God, what is *spoken of God*, and *where* it is spoken of *God*, and denoting *God* only, cannot be spoken of him; nor indeed accommodated to him. 4. The instances of *Moses* are most remote from the businesse in hand: It is said of *Moses*, that he brought the Children of *Israel* out of *Ægypt*, and so he did, as their chiefe *Leader and Ruler*, so that he was a *Redeemer* to that people, as he was instrumentall in the hand of God, working by his power and Presence with him those mighty workes, which made way for their deliverance and Redemption. But where is it said of *Moses*, or any one else, that he was God; that what God said of himselfe, was said of *Moses* & accomplished in him? Or where ever did *Moses* speak in the name of *God*, and say, *I Jehovah* will do this, and this, or be so, and so, unto my people? 5. It is true, men may be said to *do* in their place and kind of operation, what God doth do; He as the *principall efficient*, they as the *Instrumentall* cause, and so may every other creature in the world; as the *Sunne* gives light and heat; but shall therefore that which God speakes in his own name of himselfe, be so much as accommodated

commodated unto them? 6. The *Conjunction* that is between God and Christ, according to to our *Catechists*, is but of *Love* and *Favour* on the *part of God*, of *Obedience* and dependance on the part of Christ; but this in the same kind, though not in the same *degree*, is between God & all Believers; so that of them also, what is spoken of God may be spoken.

§. 88. And thus, through the presence of God, have I gone through with the consideration of all the Testimonies, given in the Scripture to the Deity of Christ, which these *Catechists* thought good to take notice of; with a full Answer to their long Chap. *de Persona Christi*. The Learned Reader knows how much all the Arguments we insist on, and the Testimonies we produce in this cause, might have been improved to a greater *Advantage* of clearnesse and evidence, had I taken liberty to handle them, as they naturally fall into severall heads, from the Demonstration of all the *Names*, and *Properties*, all the *Workes*, and *Lawes*, all the *Worship*, and *Honour* of God, to be given and ascribed to Jesus Christ: But the worke I had to doe cast my endeavour in this businesse into that order and method, wherein it is here presented to the Reader.

§. 89. The conclusion of our Catechists is a long *Harangue*, wherein they labour to insinuate the *prejudicialnesse* of our Doctrine to the *true knowledge* of Christ, and the obtaining of Salvation by him, with the certain foundation that is laid in theirs, for the participation of all the benefits of the Gospell. The only *medium* they fix upon, for to gaine both these ends by, is this, that *we deny Christ to be a true man*, which they assert. That the first of these is *notoriously* false, is known to all other men, and is acknowledged in their own Consciences. Of the truth of the latter elsewhere. He that had a perfect *humane nature*, Soule and body, with all the naturall and essentiall properties of them both; He who was borne so, lived so, dyed so, rose againe so, was, and is a perfect man; So that all the benefits that we do, or may receive from *Jesus Christ*, as a *perfect man*, like unto us in all things, *sinne only excepted*, there is a way open for, in this our Confession of him. In the mean time, the great foundation of our Faith, Hope, and Expectation lyes in this, that *He is the Sonne of the Living God*, and so, that *God redeemed his Church with his own blood*; He who was of the Fathers, *according*

to the flesh, being God over all, blessed for ever: Which if He had not been, He could not have performed the work, which for us He had to do. It is true, perhaps as *a meer man* He might do all that our *Catechists* acknowledge him to have done, and accomplish all that they expect from him; but for us, who fly to him, as one that *suffered for our sinnes*, and made *satisfaction* to the justice of God for them, who wrought out a *Righteousnesse*, that is reckoned to all that believe, that *quickens* us when we are *dead*, and sends the Holy Ghost to dwell and abide in us, and is himselfe present with us, &c. It is impossible we should ever have the least consolation in our *flying for refuge* to him, unlesse we had this grounded perswasion concerning his Eternall Power and Godhead. We cannot think He was *made* the Sonne of God, and a *God*, upon the account of what he did for us; but that *being God*, and the *Son of God*, herein was his Love made manifest, that he was *made flesh*, took upon him the *forme of a servant*, and became therein for us *obedient unto death, the death of the Crosse*. Many indeed and inexpressible are the encouragements unto Faith, and Consolation in believing, that we do receive from Christs being made *like* to us, a *perfect man*, wherein he underwent what we were obnoxious unto, and whereby He knowes how to be compassionate unto us; but that any sweetnesse can be hence derived unto any, who do refuse to own the fountaine, whence all the streames of Love and Mercy, that runne in the *humane nature* of Christ do flow, that we deny. Yea that our Adversaries in this businesse have any foundation for faith Love, or Hope, or can have any acceptance with God, or with Jesus Christ, but rather that they are cursed on the one hand for robbing him of the Glory of his *Deity*, and on the other for putting their confidence in a *man*, we dayly demonstrate from innumerable Testimonies of Scripture. And for these men, the truth is, as they lay out the choicest of all their endeavoures to prove him not to be God by nature, and so not at all, (for a *made God, a second-rank God, a Deifyed man*, is no God, the Lord our God being one, and the conceit of it brings in the *Polutheisme* of the Heathen amongst the professors of the name of Christ) so they also deny him to be *true man*, now he is in Heaven, or to retaine the nature of a man: and so insteed of *a* Christ that was God from Eternity, made a man in one Person

son unto Eternity, they believe in a Christ, who *was a man*, and is *made a God*, who never had the *nature of God*, and had then the nature of man, but hath *lost* it. This M. *Biddle* after his Masters instructs his Disciples in, in his lesser *Catechisme* Chap. 10. that although *Christ rose with his fleshly body*, wherein he was crucifyed, yet now he hath a *spirituall Body*, not in its *qualityes*, but substance; a body that hath neither *flesh nor bones*. What he hath done with his other body, where he laid it aside, or how he disposed of it, he doth not declare.

CHAP. XV.

Of the Holy Ghost, his Deity, Graces, and Operations.

Mr BIDDLE'S 5th Chapter examined.

Q. *HOW many Holy Spirits of Christians are there?*
A. Eph. 4. 4.
Q. Wherein consists the prerogative of the Holy Spirit above other Spirits?
A. 1 Cor 2. 10, 11.
Q. Whence is the Holy Ghost sent?
A. 1 Pet. 1. 12.
Q. By whom?
A Gal. 4. 6.
Q. *Doth not Christ affirme that he also sends him? How speaketh he?*
A. Joh. 16. 7.
Q. Had Jesus Christ always the power to send the Holy Ghost, or did he obtaine it at a certaine time?
A. Act. 2. 32, 33. Joh. 7. 39.
Q. What were the generall benefits accruing to Christians by the Holy Ghost?
A. 1 Cor. 12. 13. Rom. 8. 16, 26, 27. Rom. 5. 5. Col. 1. 8. Eph. 1. 17. Rom. 15. 13. Rom. 14. 17. Act. 9 31. Eph. 3. 16.
Q. What are the special benefits accruing to the Apostles by the Holy Ghost? What saith Christ to them hereof?
A. Joh. 15. 26. Joh. 16. 13.
Q. Should the Holy Ghost lead them into all truth, as speaking of Himselfe, and imparting of his own fulnesse? What saith Christ concerning him?
A. Joh. 16. 13, 14.
Q. Do men receive the Holy Ghost while they are of the world, and in their naturall condition, *to the end that they may* become the Children of God, may receive the word, may believe, may repent, may obey Christ? *or,*

after they are become the Children of God, have received the word, do believe, do repent, do obey Christ?

A. Joh. 14. 16, 17. 1 Cor. 2. 14. Gal. 4. 6 Act. 8. 14, 15, 16. Joh. 7. 38, 39. Act. 19. 1, 2. Eph. 1. 13. Gal. 3. 14. Act. 15. 7, 8. Act. 2. 38. Act. 5. 32.

EXAMINATION.

Of the Deity of the Holy Ghost: and his Worke, &c.

§. 1. See his confession in his Epistle to his Book against the Deity of Christ. *Clopenburgius vindicia pro Deitate S. S. adversus Pneumatomach. Bedellum Anglum.*

THE Fifth Chapter of our *Catechist*, is, concerning the *Holy Ghost*, for reducing of whom into the *Order* and ranke of Creatures, Mr *B.* hath formerly taken great paines; following therein the *Macedonians* of *Old*, and leaving his *new* Masters, the *Socinians*, who deny him his *Personality*, and leave him to be only the *efficacy*, or *Energy* of the power of God. The *designe* is the same in both, the *meanes* used to bring it about differ. The *Socinians* not able to answer the Testimonies proving him to be God, to be no creature, do therefore deny his *Personality*; Mr *B.* being not able to stand before the cleare evidence of his *Personality*, denyes his *Deity*. What he hath done in this Chapter I shall consider; what he hath elsewhere done, hath already met with a detection from *another hand*.

§. 2. Q. *How many Holy Spirits of Christians are there?* Ans. *One spirit.* Eph. 4. 4.

I must take leave to put *one* Question to M. *B.* that we may the better know the mind and meaning of *his*: and that is; What he means by the *Holy Spirits* of Christians: If he intend that Spirit which they *worship*, invocate, believe, and are *Baptized* into his name, who *quickens*, and sanctifies them, and from whom they have their supplies of Grace; it is true, there is but *one only Spirit* of Christians, as is evident, *Eph.* 4. 4. and this Spirit is *God blessed for ever*: nor can any be called that *one Spirit of Christians*, but he that is so. But if by the *Holy Spirits* of Christians, He intends *created Spirituall beings*, sent out of God for the good of Christians, of those that believe, there are then an *innumerable company of Holy Spirits* of Believers; for all the Angells are *ministring Spirits*, *sent forth to minister for them*, *who shall be heirs of Salvation*, *Heb.* 1. 13, 14. So that by this one Testimony, that there is but *one Holy Spirit* of Christians, that *Holy Spirit* is exempted from the number of all *created Spirits*, and reckoned as the

the object of their worship, with the one God, and one Lord; *Ephes.* 4. 4,5,6. When yet they worship the Lord their *God alone*, and *him only do they serve*, *Mat.* 4. 10.

His second Q. is, *Wherein consists the Prerogative of that Holy Spirit above other Spirits.* Ans. 1. *Cor.* 2, 10, 11. §. 3.

The *Prerogative* of that Holy Spirit, of whom we speake, is, that of *God* above his *Creature*: the *Prerogative* of an Infinite, Eternall, Selfe-subsisting Being. Yea and that this is indeed his *Prerogative*, we need not seek for proofe beyond that Testimony here produced by Mr *B.* (though to another purpose) in Answer to his Question. He that *searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God*, is God. To search all things is the same with *knowing* all things; so the Apostle interprets it in the next verse: *None knoweth the things of God, save the Spirit of God.* To *know all things*, is to be *omniscient*. But he that is *Omniscient*, is God. His *Angels* hee charged with folly. *Omniscience* is an essentiall Attribute of God: And therefore *Socinus* in his disputation with * *Franken*, durst not allow Christ to be *omniscient*, least he should also grant him to be *Infinite* in Essence. De *Adoratione Jesu Christi disputatio*: p. 18, 19.

Againe; He that *searches*, or knowes τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ, the *deep things of God*, is God; None can know the *deep things* of an *Infinite* Wisdome and Understanding, but He that is Infinite. All creatures are excluded from an acquaintance with the *deep things* of God, but only as he *voluntarily* revealeth them, *Rom.* 11. 34. *Who hath known the mind of God, or who hath been his Counsellor?* That is; no Creature hath so been; θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε, *Joh.* 1. 18. Now the Spirit doth not know the *deep things of God*, by his voluntary Revelation of them. For as the *Spirit* of a *man* knows the things of a Man, so doth the Spirit of God know the things of God. This is not because they are revealed to the *Spirit of a man*, but because that is the Principle of Operation in a man, and is conscious to all its own Actions and Affaires. And so it is with the *Spirit of God*: being *God*, and having the same Understanding, and Will, and Power with God the Father, and Sonne; as the Spirit of a man knowes the things of a man, so doth He the things of God. Thus in the *beginning* of *this*, as in the *close* of the last Chapter, Mr B. hath provided sufficiently for his own *conviction*, and the scattering of all his *Paralogismes*, and *Sophisticall* insinuations, running through them both. §. 4.

§. 5. The designe of this present Chapter, being to pursue what Mr *B.* hath some years since publickly undertaken, *viz.* to disprove the Deity of the Holy Ghost; his aime here being to divert the thoughts of his *Catechumeni* from an apprehension thereof, by his Propossall and Answers of such Questions, as serve to his designe, pretending to deliver the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost from the Scripture, and not once producing any of those Texts, which are most usually insisted on, for the confirmation of his Deity, (with what Christian *Candor* and *Ingenuity*, is easily discovered) I shall briefly from the Scripture, in the first place, establish the Truth concerning the eternall *Deity* of the Person of the Holy Ghost; and then consider his Questions in their order, so farre as shall be judged meet or necessary.

§. 6. I shall not go forth unto any long discourse on this subject: Some plaine Testimonies of Scripture will evince the Truth we contend for; being the Heads of as many *Arguments*, if any one shall be pleased to make use of them in that way.

§. 7. I. Then, The spirit *created, formed,* and *adorned* this World; and is therefore God. *He that made all things, is God.* Heb. 3.4. *By the word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the Host of them by the* SPIRIT *of his mouth*: Psal. 33.6. *By his* SPIRIT *hath he garnished the Heavens.* Job. 26.13. *The* SPIRIT *of God hath made mee, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.* Chap. 33.4. Psal. 104.30. He that makes the Heavens, and garnisheth them; He that maketh man, and giveth him life, is *God.* So in the beginning מרחפת *motabat se*, moved himselfe, as a *Dove* warming its young, as he afterward appeared in the forme of a *Dove.* And hence that which is ascribed unto God absolutely in one place, is in another ascribed to the spirit absolutely, as *Exod.* 4.15. *Numb.* 12.8. what it is affirmed that God doth, will do, or did, is affirmed of the Spirit, *Act.* 1.16. cap. 28. 25. so *Numbers* 14.22. *Deut.* 6.16. What is said of God, is affirmed of the Spirit, *Isa.* 63.10. *Acts* 7.51. so also *Deut.* 32. 12. compared with *Isa.* 63.14. innumerable other instances of the same kind might be added.

§. 8. II. He *Regenerates us*; Unless we are *borne againe of Water and the Spirit, we cannot enter into the Kingdome of God, Ioh.* 3 5. 2 *Thessalon.* 2.13. 1 *Pet.* 1.2. He also *searcheth all things, even the deep things*

of

of God, as was before observed, 1. *Cor.* 2. 10, 11. From him is our *Illumination*, *Ephes.* 1. 17, 18. 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. *Joh.* 14. 26. *The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, he shall teach you all things*, Chap. 16. 13. The spirit of Truth *shall guide you into all Truth*; The *Holy Ghost shall teach you*, *Luk.* 12. 12. And he *foreteleth things to come*. *Joh* 16. 13 1 *Tim.* 4. 1. which is a property of God, whereby he will be known from all false Gods, *Isa.* 41. 22, 23. &c. and he is in some of these places expressly called God: as also, 1 *Cor.* 12. v. 6. compared with v. 11. and he is *immense*, who *dwells in all Believers*.

III. He *dwelleth in us* as God in a Temple, *Rom.* 8. 9. 1 *Cor.* 3. 16. thereby *sanctifying* us 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *comforting* us *Joh.* 16. 8. and *helping* our *infirmities*. *Rom.* 8. 26. *Mortifying* our sins, *Rom.* 8. 13. Creating in us Christian Graces, *Gal.* 6. yea he is the *Author* of all *Grace*; as is evident in that promise made of his presence with the *Messiah*, *Isa.* 11. 2. I say with the *Messiah*, for of him only are those words to be understood; to which purpose, I cannot but adde the words of an old *Frier* to the *shame* of some amongst us, who should know more, or be more Christian in their expositions of Scripture; saith he (speaking of this place) *Note that in innumerable places of the Talmud, this is expounded of the Messiah, and never of any other, by any one, who is of any Authority among the Hebrews: Wherefore it is evident, that some amongst us, too much Judaizing, do erre, whilest they feare not to expound this literally of Josiah: but that this is to be understood of the Messiah only is shewed by Rabbi Solomon, who expounds it of him, and not of Josiah; which according to his way, be would never have done, if without the injury of his Talmud and Targum, and the prejudice of all his predecessors, he could have expounded it otherwise.* So farre he. §. 9.

Nota quod in locis innumeris in Talmud hoc exponitur de Messiah, & nunquam de alio, ab aliquo qui alicujus apud Hæbræos authoritatis sit; quare patet quod errant, nimium Judaizantes nostri, qui hoc de Iosia ad literam non verentur exponere: de solo quippe Messia hoc intelligendum fore, ostenditur per R. Solomoh, qui hoc de ipso non de Iosiah exponit; quod juxta morem suum nunquam egisset, si absq; injuria sui Talmud & Targum, & sine prædecessorum suorum omnium præjudicio, aliter exponere potuisset. Reymund. Marti: pug: fid: p. 3 *D.* 1. c. 11.

It is not a little strange, that some Christians should venture farther in perverting the Testimonies of Scripture concerning the Messiah, then the Jewes dare to do.

IV. He *makes*, and *appoints to himselfe*, and his service, *Ministers* of the Church, *Act.* 13. 2. giving unto them *Powers*, and §. 10.

working various and Wonderfull workes, as *he pleaseth*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 8.

§. 11. V. He is *sinned against*; and so offended with sinne, that the sinne against him shall never be forgiven, *Math.* 12, 31. Though it be not against his Person, but some *especiall* Grace and Dispensation of his.

§. 12. VI. He is the *Object of Divine Worship*; We being B*aptized* into his Name, as that of the Father and Sonne, *Mat.* 28.19. And *Grace* is prayd for from him, as from Father and Sonne, 2 *Cor.* 13.13. *Revel.* 1. 4. *Rom.* 10.14. He is to be Head of Churches, *Revel.* 2.3. But God will not give this glory to another, *Isa.* 42. 8. Also he hath the *Name* of God given him, *Esa.* 6.9. compared with *Acts* 28. 25,26. and *Isa.* the 63. ch. v. 13,14. with *Ps.* 18.41, 52.2 *Sam.* 23.2,3. *Act.* 5.3. & the Attributes of God are ascribed to him, as (1.) Ubiquity, or *Omnipresence*, *Psal:* 139.7. 1 *Cor.* 3. 16. (2.) *Omniscience*, 1 *Cor.* 2.10. *Ioh.* 16.13. His Omnipotency and Eternity are both manifest from the Creation.

Οὗτος ὁ θεὸς δοξαζόμενος ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, παντὸς ἀεὶ, ἀϊδὸς ἀεὶ, πνεῦμα ἄϋλον ἀεὶ. *Epiphan. Anrat.* c. 73, Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ συνπαρὰ, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ συμφοσκυνούμενον, καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον. *Symbol. Conc: Constantinop:*

To all this, in a word, it may be added, that he is a *Person*: the denyall whereof is the only *χρυσοφύγελον* of the *Socinians*. They acknowledge, that if He be a *Person*, he is God. But 1. He is a Person, who hath a *Name*, and in whose name something is done, as we are said to be Baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, *Mat.* 28.19. And (2.) He is conjoyned with the *other Divine Persons*, as one of them, 2 *Cor.* 13.13, *Revel.* 1.4,5. *Math.* 28.19. (3.) He hath an Understanding, 1 *Cor.* 2.11. and a Will, 1 *Cor.* 12.11. (4.) To him are Speaking, and Words ascribed, and such actions, as are peculiar to Persons, *Acts* 13. 2. *Acts* 20. 28. &c.

§. 13. What remaines of this Chapter will be of a briefe and easy dispatch: The next question is:

Whence is the Holy Ghost sent? Answ. 1 Pet. 1. 12. *Down from Heaven.*

1. This advantageth not at all M. *Biddles designe* against the Holy Ghost, to prove him not to be God, that he is *sent down from Heaven*, whereby he supposeth, that his *coming* from one place to another is intimated: Seeing he supposes God to be *so in Heaven*; yea in some *certaine place* of Heaven, as at the same time not to be elsewhere; so that if ever he be in the Earth, He must *come down from* Heaven.

2.

2. Nor is there any thing in his being *sent*, prejudiciall to the prerogative of his divine Being. For he, who is God, *equall* in nature to the Father, and the Son, yet in respect of the order of that dispensation, that these *three* who *are in Heaven*, who are also *one*, have engaged in for the Salvation of men, may be *sent* of the Father and the Son, having the Execution of that worke which they respectively concurre in, in an eminent manner to him committed. §. 14. 1 Joh. 5. 7.

3. Where ever the *Spirit* is said to *descend* from Heaven, it is to be understood according to the *Analogy* of what we have already spoken, concerning the presence of God in Heaven, with his *Looking*, and *going down* from thence, which I shall not repeat againe. Essentially he is every where *Psal.* 139. 1, 2, 3, &c. §. 15.

4. In that place of *Peter* alleadged by M. *Biddle*, not the *Person* of the Spirit, but his *gifts* on the Apostles, and his *Operations* in them, whose great and visible foundations were laid *Act.* 2. on the day of *Pentecost*, are intended.

§. 16.

The two next Question, leading only to an Expression of the *sending of the Holy Ghost by the Father and the Son*, though M. *Biddles Christians* differ about the interpretation of the places produced for the proofe thereof, and there ly no small Argument and Evidence of the Deity of Christ, in his *sending of the Holy Ghost*, as the Father sends him, yet there being an Agreement in the Expressions themselves, I shall not insist upon them. He proceeds.

Q. *Had Jesus Christ alwaies the power to send the Holy Ghost, or did he obtaine it at a certaine time.* Ans. Act. 2. 32, 33. Joh. 7. 39. §. 17.

The intendment of this Querie is, to conclude from some *certaine respect and manner* of sending the Holy Ghost to the thing it selfe: from the sending him in a *visible*, *glorious*, *plentifull*, *eminent* manner, as to the Effusion of his gifts and Graces, to the sending of him *absolutely*, which me thinkes a *Master of Arts* should know to be a *Sophisticall* way of arguing. ἁπλῶς καθ' ὅτι

2. It endeavours also, from the *Exercise* of Power to conclude to the *receiving* of the Power it selfe; and that not the *absolute* Exercise of it neither, but in some certaine respect, as was spoken. This then is that, which M. *Biddle* concludes. Because Christ when he was exalted, or when he *ascended* into Heaven, had

had the accomplishment of the *Promise* actually in the *sending forth* of the spirit, in that abundant and plentifull manner which was Propheſyed of by *Joel* Cap. 2. 28. therefore he then first *received Power* to send the Spirit. Which 4. by the Testimony of Christ himselfe is false, and not the sence of the Holy Ghost in the places mentioned; seeing that before his *Ascension* he breathed on his *Disciples*, and bad them *receive the Holy Ghost*. Nay 5. that he had power of *sending the Holy Ghost*, and did actually *send* him, not only before his *Ascension* and Exaltation, but also before his Incarnation, is expresly affirmed 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. *The Spirit that was in the Prophets of old*, was the *Spirit of Christ*, and sent by him; as was that Spirit, by which he preached in the dayes of the *old disobedient world*; which places have been formerly vindicated at large. So that 6. as that place *Act.* 2. 32, 33. is there expounded to be concerning the *plentifull effusion* of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in the times of the Gospell, according to the propheſy of *Joel*: so also is that of *Joh.* 7. 39. it being positively affirmed, as to the thing it selfe, that he *gave the Holy Ghost* before his exaltation, though not in that *abundant manner* as afterwards. And so neither of them conclude any thing, as to the time of Christs *receiving power* to send the spirit; which upon the supposition of such a worke, as for the accomplishment whereof it was necessary the Holy Ghost should be *sent*, he had from Eternity.

Ioh. 20. 22.

§. 18. About the next *Question* we shall not contend. It is,

Q. *What were the generall benefits accruing to Christians by the Holy Ghost?* whereunto sundry texts of Scripture, that make mention of the Holy Ghost, his *graces*, and *gifts*, are subjoyned. Upon the whole I have only some few things to *animadvert*.

§. 19. 1. If by the word *generall benefits*, he limits the receiving of those benefits of the Holy Ghost to any certain time, (as suppose the time of his first plentifull effusion upon the Ascension of Jesus Christ, and the preaching of the Gospell to all Nations thereupon;) *as* it is a *sacrilegious conception*, robbing Believers of *after ages*, to the end of the world, of all the fruits of the efficacy of the Spirit, without which they can neither enjoy *Communion* with God in this Life, nor ever be brought to an etetnall fruition of him: So it is most *false*, and contrary to the expresse prayer of our Saviour, desiring the same things for them, *who*

should

should believe on his name to the end of the world, as he did for those who conversed with him in the dayes of his flesh. But I will suppose this is not his intention: because it would plainely deny that there are any *Christians* in the world, (*which yet was the opinion of some of his friends heretofore,) for if *we have not the Spirit of Christ we are none of his*. Socinus. Epist. 3. ad Math. Rad. Rom. 8. 9.

2. The things annumerated, may be called *generall benefits*, §. 20. because they are *common* to all Believers, as to the substance, *Essence*, or *Being* of them; though in respect of their degrees they are communicated variously to the severall *Individuals*; the same spirit *dividing* to every one as he will; they are so *generall* to them all, that every *particular* Believer enjoyes them all. 1 Cor. 12. 11.

3. The Annumeration here given us, is very *farre* and remote from being *complete*; there being only some *few fruits* of the *Spirit*, and priviledges, which we receive by our receiving of him, recounted: and that in a very *confused manner*, one thing being added after another, without any order or coherence at all. Yea of the *Benefits* we receive by the spirit, of the *Graces* he workes in us, of the *Helps* he affords us, of that *Joy*, and *Consolation* he imparts unto us, of the dayly *Assistances* we receive from him, of the *Might* of his *power* put forth in us, of the *Efficacy* of his Operations, the *Constancy* of his presence, the *priviledges* by him imparted, there is not by any in this life a full account to be given. To insist on particulars is not my present taske: I have also in part done it elsewhere. §. 21. Perseverance of Saints c. 8.

4. I desire M. *Biddle* seriously to consider, whether even the things which he thinkes good to mention, may possibly be ascribed to a *meer Creature*, or that all believers are by such an one *baptized into one body*; that we *are all made to drinke into one Spirit*, &c. But of these things before. Unto this he adds,

Q. *What are the speciall benefits accruing to the Apostles by the Holy Ghost: and what saith Christ to them thereof?* Answ. Joh. 15. 26. Act. 16. 13. §. 22.

Besides the *Graces* of the Spirit, which the Apostles as Believers, received in a plentifull manner: they had also his Presence by his extraordinary *gifts* to fit them for that whole extraordinary Work, whereunto of him they were called. For as by his Authority they were *seperated* to the worke, and were to performe it unto him *Act.* 13. 2. So whatever worke they were to per-

forme either as Apostles, or as penmen of the Scripture of the *New Testament*; they had suitable *Gifts* bestowed on them, by him 1 *Cor.* 12. *inspiration from him suitable to their worke:* 2 *Pet.* 1. 21. and 2 *Tim.* 3. 17. the Scripture being of *inspiration from God*, because the Holy men, that wrote it, were *inspired* or *moved* by the Holy Ghost. And as this Holy Ghost, who is God, *working all in all*, that divideth of his gifts, as *he will* 1 *Cor.* 12. 6, 12. and giveth all Gifts whatever to the Church, that it doth enjoy; so did he in an *especiall manner* with the Apostles.

διὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι.

§. 23. Now our Saviour Christ being to *leave the World*, giving gracious promises to his Disciples, he considered them under a twofold capacity or condition: 1. Of *Believers*, of such as followed him, and *Believed* in him, wherein their estate was common with that of all them, who *were to Believe on him to the end of the World.* 2. Of *Apostles* & of such, as he intended to imploy in that great worke of *planting* his Church in the world, & propagating his Gospell to the ends of it. Under both these considerations doth he promise the Spirit to his *Disciples. Joh.* 13, 14, 15, 16. praying his Father for the Accomplishment of those promises: *Chap.* 17. that as *Believers* they might be kept in the Course of their obedience to the end; in which regard he made those promises no lesse to us, then to them. And

Joh. 17, 20.

2. That as *Apostles* they might be furnished for their worke, preserved, and made prosperous therein. Of this *latter* sort, some passages in the verses here mentioned seeme to be, & may have a pecular regard thereunto, & yet in their substance are of the first kind, & are made good to all believers. Neither is there any more said concerning the teaching and guidance of the Spirit into the Truth, in *Joh.* 15. 26. & 16. 13. then is said 1 *Joh.* 2. 20, 27. where it is expresly assigned to all *Believers*: Of that *Unction* and *teaching* of the Spirit, of his preserving us in all Truth needfull for our Communion with God; of his *bringing to mind* what Christ had spoken for our Consolation and Establishment with efficacy and power, things I feare despised by M. *Biddle*, this is not a season to treat.

§. 24. That which followes concernes the *Order* and way of procedure, insisted on by the *Sonne*, and Holy Ghost, in carrying on

the

the Worke of our Salvation, and propagation of the Gospell, whose soveraigne fountaine is in the bosome of the Father. His Querie is.

Q. *Should the Holy Ghost lead them into all truth, as speaking of himselfe, and imparting of his own fulnesse? What saith Christ concerning him?* Ans. Joh. 16. 13, 14.

1. The Scripture proposeth the Holy Ghost in the Communication of his Gifts and Graces under a double consideration. 1. *Absolutely*: as he is God himselfe: and so he *speaketh of himselfe*, and the Churches are commanded to attend to what *he so saith*, *Revel.* 2. 29. and he imparts of his *own fulnesse*: the self same spirit dividing to every one, *as he will*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 11. And in this sence what the Prophets say in the *Old* Testament, *The word of the Lord*, and thus saith the Lord, in the *New*, they are said to speake by the *Spirit*: *Mat.* 22. 43. *Acts* 1. 16. 2 *Pet.* 1. 21. §. 25.

2. *Relatively*: and that both in respect of *Subsistence* and *Operation*, as to the great worke of saving sinners by Jesus Christ. And as in the first of these senses, he is not *of* himselfe, being the *Spirit of the Father and the Sonne, proceeding from them both.* So neither doth he speake of himselfe, but according to what he receiveth of the Father, and the Sonne. 2. Our Saviour Christ saies here, *he shall not speake of himselfe*: but he nowhere saies, *He shall not impart of his own fulnesse*, which is M. *Biddles* Addition to *speake himselfe* shewes the originall Authority of him that speakes, *whereby* he speakes: to be in himselfe which as to the words and workes pointed to, is not in the Holy Ghost Personally considered, and as in this dispensation. But, to *impart of his own fulnesse*, is to give out of that, which is eminently in himself: which the Holy Ghost doth, as hath been shewen. 3. Christ in the words insisted on, comforting his Disciples with the promise of the presence of his Spirit, when he should be bodily absent from them, acquaints them also with the Workes that he should do, when he came to thē, in that *cleer, eminent, & upon them* & *abundant* manner, which he had *promised*; which is not any new worke, or any other, then what he had already acquainted them with, nor the Accomplishment of any thing, but what he had laid the foundation of: yea that all the Mercy, Grace, Light, Guidance, Direction, Consolation, Peace, Joy, Gifts, that he

should communicate to them, and blesse them withall, should be no other, but what were procured and purchased for them by himselfe. These things is the Spirit said to *heare* and *speake*, to *receive* and *communicate*, as being the proper purchase, and Inheritance of another: and in so doing to *glorify* him, whose they are, in that peculiar sence, and manner. All that discourse which we have of the *Mission*, and sending of the Holy Ghost, and his proceeding or coming forth from the Father and Sonne, for the ends specifyed, *Joh.* 14.26. & 15. 26 & 16. 7, 13. concernes not at all the *eternall Procession* of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Sonne, as to his distinct *personality* and subsistence, but belongs to that *Oeconomy* or dispensation of ministry, that the whole *Trinity* proceedeth in, for the accomplishment of the worke of our Salvation.

§. 26. The last *Quere*, by the *heap* of Scriptures, that are gathered in answer to it, seems to have most weight laid upon it: but is indeed of all the rest most *weakely Sophisticall*: The words of it are.

§. 27. Q. *Do men receive the Holy Ghost, while they are of the World, and in their naturall condition, to the end that they may become the Children of God, may receive the Word, may Believe, may Repent, may obey Christ, or after they are become the Children of God, have received the Word, do Believe, do Repent, do obey Christ?*

Ans. The Answer is as above. To the same purpose is that of the *Racovian* Catechisme.

Nonne ad credendum Evangelio S. S. interiore dono opus est?

Is there not need of the internall Gift of the Spirit, that we may believe the Gospell.

Nullo modo, non enim in Scripturis legimus, cuiquam id conferri donum, nisi credenti Evangelio Cap. 6. de Promiss. S.S.

Ans. *By no means; for we do not read in the Scripture, that that gift is conferred on any, but him that believes the Gospell.*

Remove the ambiguity of that Expression, *Believe the Gospell*, and those *two Questions* perfectly fall in together. It may then be taken either for, *Believing the Doctrine of the Gospell*, in opposition to the Law, and in this sence it is not here enquired after; or for the *power of Believing in the subject*, and in that sence it is here denyed.

§. 28. Now the designe of this Question is, to deny the effectuall Operation of the Holy Ghost, for, & in the *Conversion, Regeneration*,

on, and *Sanctification* of the Elect, and to vindicate the whole work of Faith, Holineſſe, Quickning, &c. to our ſelves. The way deſigned for the proofe and eſtabliſhment of this Inſinuation conſiſts, in producing ſundry Teſtimonies, wherein it is affirmed, that thoſe who do believe, and are the Children of God, do *receive the Spirit* for other ends and purpoſes, then thoſe here enumerated. The ſumme of his Argument is this: If they who *do believe*, and are the *Children of God*, do receive the Spirit of God, for their *Adoption*, and the *carrying* on of the work of their ſanctification, with the *ſupply* of new Grace, the Confirmation and enlargement of what they have received, with *Joy*, *Conſolation*, and *Peace*, with other Gifts, that are neceſſary for any work or employment, that they are called unto; then the Holy Spirit doth not *quicken*, nor *regenerate* them, nor *work Faith* in them, nor *make* them the Children of God, nor implant them into Chriſt. Now when M. B. proves this conſequence, I will confeſſe him to be *Maſter* of one *Art*, which he never learned at *Oxford*; unleſſe it were his buſines to learne what he was taught to avoyd.

2. But Mr B. hath one *fetch* of his skill more in this Queſtion. He askes, whether men *do receive* the Holy Ghoſt, when they are of the World; And for a confutation of any ſuch Apprehenſion, produceth Teſtimonies of Scripture, that the *world cannot receive the Holy Ghoſt*, nor *the naturall Man the things of God*. But who told this *Gentleman* that we ſay, men whileſt they are *in*, and *of* the World, do receive the Spirit of God, or the things of the Spirit, in the Scripture ſence of the uſe of that word, *receiving*? The expreſſion is *metaphoricall*, yet alwaies in the caſe of the things of the Goſpell denoting the Actings of Faith in them, who are ſaid to *receive* any thing from God. Now if this *Gentleman* could perſwade us that we ſay, that we *receive* the Spirit by Faith, to the end that we may have *Faith*, he might as eaſily lead us about whether he pleaſed, as the *Philiſtims* did *Samſon*, when they had put out his eyes. A little then to *inſtruct* this Catechiſt; I deſire him to take notice, that properly the ſpirit is *received by Faith*, to the Ends and purpoſes by him mentioned, with many ſuch others, as might be added; but yet before mens being enabled to *receive* it, that Spirit by his *power* and the efficacy of his Grace, *quickneth*, *regenerateth*, and *worketh* Faith

§. 29.

Faith in their hearts. In briefe, the Spirit is considered, and promised, either as a Spirit of *Regeneration*, with all the concomitants, and essentiall consequents thereof; or as a Spirit of *Adoption*, and the consequents thereof. In the *first* sence he works in men in order of nature, antecedent to their believing; Faith being a fruit of that Spirit: In the *latter*, and for the ends and purposes thereof, he is received by *Faith*, and given in order of nature upon believing.

§. 30. 3. That the *World cannot receive the Spirit, nor the naturall Man the things of God*, is from hence; that the Spirit hath not wrought in them, that which is necessary to *enable* them thereunto; which is evident from what is affirmed of the *Impotency* of the *naturall Man*, as to his *receiving* the things of God; for if the Reason, why *he cannot receive the things of God*, is, because he is a *naturall Man*, then, unlesse there be some other Power, then what is in himselfe, to translate him from that condition, it is impossible, that ever he, who is a Naturall Man, should ever be otherwise; for he can only alter that condition, by that, which he cannot do. But,

§. 31. 4. That the *Spirit* is given for, and doth work Regeneration, and Faith in men, I shall not now insist on the many Testimonies, whereby it is usually, and invincibly confirmed. There is no one Testimony given to our utter impotency, to *convert*, or *regenerate* our selves, to *believe*, *repent*, and *turne* to God; no promise of the Covenant, to give a *new Heart*, *new Obedience* through Christ; no assertion of the *Grace of God*, and the efficacy of his power, which is exalted in the vocation and conversion of Sinners, but sufficiently evinces the Truth thereof. That one eminent instance shall close our Consideration of this Chapter, which we have *Titus* 3.5,6. *Not by workes of Righteousnesse, which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of Regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly by Jesus Christ our Saviour.*

§. 32. Of the *First* head made by men, professing the Religion of Jesus Christ, unto the *Deity of the Spirit*, attempting to ranke him among the *workes of his own hand*, of the peculiar espousing of an enmity against him by *Macedonius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, from whom the *ensuing* πνευματομαχοι took their *name*, of the *Novell inventions* of *Faustus Socinus* and his followers, denying the *Personality*

Personality of the Spirit, making him to be nothing, but the *efficacy* of the Power of God, or the Power of God, this is no place to treat. Besides, the Truth is, untill they will speak clearly what they meane by the Spirit of God, and so *assert* something, as well *adeny*, they may justly be neglected. They tell us it is *virtus Dei*: but whether that *virtus* be *substantia* or *accidens*, they will not tell us; it is they say *potentia Dei*: this we confesse; but say, he is not *potentia* ἐνεργητικὴ, but ὑποστατικὴ; and that because we prove him to be God. What then hath been spoken of Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost, I shall shut up with that Distich of *Gregor. Naz. Sent. Spir. lib.* 3.

πάντα μὲν αἰὲν ἄριστα θεοπρεπὲς ἔργα τελείστω
ἡ δ' τριὰς πάντων ἐξοχά σοι μελέτω.

CHAP. XVI.

Of Salvation by Christ.

Mr *Biddles* 6th Chapter Considered.

THis is a short Chapter, and will speedily receive its Consideration. That Christ is a *Saviour*, and that He is so called in Scripture, is confessed on all hands. M. B's Masters were the first, who directly called into question amongst Christians, on what account principally he is so called. Of his *Faith* in this businesse, and theirs, we have the Summe, with the Reasons of it, in the Book of their great Apostle, *De Jesu Christo Servatore*. This Book is Answered throughont with good successe, by *Sibrandus Labbatus*. The Nerves of it cut by *Grotius*, *De satisfactione Christi*; and the reply of *Crellius* thereunto throughly removed by *Essenus* in his *Triumphus Crucis*. The whole Argumentative part of it, summ'd up into five heads, by *Michael Gittichius*, is answered by *Sudonicus Lucius*, and that Answer vindicated from the Reply of *Gittichius*. And generally those who have written upon the Satisfaction of Christ have looked upon that *Book*, as the main Master-piece of the Adversaries, and have made it their businesse to remove its *Sophistry*, and unmaske its pretensions. §. 1.

M. B.

M. B. is very *slight* and *overly* in this businesse, being not able in the method of *Procedure* imposed on himselfe, so much as to deliver his mind *significantly*, as to what he does intend. The deniall and rejection of the *satisfaction*, and *merit* of Christ, is that which the man intends, as is evident from his Preface, where he denys them *name* and *thing*. This he attempts, partly in this Chapter, partly in that concerning the Death of Christ, and also that of *Justification*. In this he would attempt the *notion* of *Salvation*, and referre it only to deliverance from death, by a glorious *Resurrection*. Some brief Animadversions may possibly rectify the mans Mistakes. His first Question we passe, as a principle in the termes of it on all sides confessed, namely, that *Christ is our Lord and Saviour*.

His Second is.

§. 2. Q. *Is Christ our Saviour originally, and of himselfe; or because he was given, exalted, and raised up by another to be a Saviour?*

Ans. Act. 4.12. & 5.31. & 13.23.

The intendment of this Quere is, to pursue the former insinuations of our *Catechist* against the Deity of Christ; as though his appointment to his *Office* of Mediation, were inconsistent with his *Divine Nature*: the vanity of which pretence hath been sufficiently already discovered. In briefe, Christ is considered either *absolutely*, with respect to his Divine Nature, and *Person*, as he is *God* in himselfe: and so he is a Saviour originally, of himselfe: For *as for our Redeemer the Lord of Hosts is his Name, the Holy one of Israel*, Isa. 47.4. *For thy Maker is thine Husband, the Lord of Hosts is his Name, the Holy one of Israel*, Ch 54.5. In this sence was Christ a Saviour *originally*, and of himselfe; But as He *took flesh*, to accomplish the work of our Redemption, by tasting death for us, though his own mercifull and gratious Will did concurre therein, yet was he eminently *designed* to that work, and given by his Father, in Love, and Mercy, contriving the work of our Salvation. And this latter is mentioned not only in the places cited by our *Catechist*, but also in an *hundred* more, and not one of them lying in the least subserviency to M. B's designe.

His last Quere is.

§. 3. Q. *How do the Saints expect to be saved by Christ?*

Ans. Rom. 5.10. Philip. 3.20,21.

The

The intendment of this *Question*, must be to Answer the generall proposall, in *what sence Christ is our Saviour, and how his People are saved by him.* Now however that be true in it selfe, which is here asserted, and is the exurgency of the Question & Answer, as connected, the Saints *expecting Salvation* by Christ, in the compleat accomplishment of it by his Power in Heaven, yet as here proposed to give an account of the whole tence, wherein *Christ is our Saviour*, is most false and deceitfull. Christ is a Saviour principally, as *he was promised*, and came to *save his people from their Sinnes*, whence he had his name of *Jesus*, or a Saviour, *Mat.* 1.21. and that by *his death*, *Heb.* 2. 14, 15. or laying downe *his life a Ransome for us*, *Math.* 20.28. and giving himselfe a price of Redemption for us, 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. *by whom we have Redemption by his blood, even the forgivenesse of sinnes*, *Eph.* 1.7. so saving or delivering us from the wrath, that is for to come; 1 *Thes.* 1. *last.* The Salvation, which we have by Christ, which this Chapter in Title pretends to discover, is from *Sinne*, the *World*, *Satan*, *Death*, *Wrath*, *Curse*, the *Law*, bearing of us unto Acceptation with God, Peace, Reconciliation, and Glory. But that the Doctrines before mentioned, without which these things cannot once be apprehended, may be obscured or lost; are these wholly omitted. Of the sence of *Rom.* 5. 10. and what is there intended by the *Life of Christ*, I shall farther treat, when I come to speak about *Justification*: and of the whole businesse under our Consideration of the death of Christ.

CHAP. XVII.

IN his Seventh Chap. he proposeth two *Questions* in generall, about the *Mediation* of Christ. Answering first, that *he is a Mediator*, from 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. 2. That he is *the Mediator of the New Covenant*, *Heb.* 8. 6. & 12 24. But as to his *work* of Mediation, what it is, wherein it doth consist, on what account principally Christ is called *our Mediator*, whether he be a *Mediator* with God *for* us, as well as a *Mediator* with us *for* God; and how he carries on that work; wherein he knows the difference between us, and his *Masters*, about this matter doth lye, he §. 1.

speaks not one word, nor gives any occasion to me, to enter into the consideration of it. What I suppose necessary to offer to this head, I shall do it in the ensuing discourse of the *Death of Christ*, the ends thereof, and the satisfaction thereby.

§. 2. And therefore I shall hereunto adde his Ninth Chapter also, which is concerning *Remission of Sinnes by Jesus Christ*. The difference between his *Masters* and us, being about the *meritorious and procuring Cause* of Remission of Sinnes by Christ, which here he mentions not; What is farther to be added thereabout, will fall in also under our Consideration of the Death of Christ, and our Justification thereby.

§. 3. His first *Question* is altogether *out* of *Question*, namely, *Who shall have remission of sins by Christ?* It is granted, All, and only Believers. *He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned*, Mark 16.16. *To as many as receive him, power is given to become the Sons of God, even as many as believe in his name*, Joh. 1. 12.

§. 4. To his next Question an Answer may be given, that will suit that following also; which is the whole of this Chapter; The *Question* is; *Doth not Christ forgive sinnes?* Ans. *Christ forgave you*, Col:3.13.

That Christ *forgives sinnes*, is taken for granted; And yet forgiveneſſe of Sin is the *supreameſt Act of* Soveraigne Divine Power, that God exerciseth in the World. Now Christ may be considered two waies. 1. *Absolutely*, as *God over all*, blessed for ever; So he forgave sinnes by his own Originall Authority and power, as the Law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy. 2. As *Mediatour*, God and Man; and so his Power was delegated to him by God the Father, as himselfe speakes: *All power is given unto me, in Heaven and in Earth*, and *Mat* 9. he saith, that he had Power *on earth to forgive sinnes, i. e.* given unto him. Now forgiveneſſe of sinnes, is either *Authoritative*, or *declarative*. The latter Christ delegated to his Apostles, and all their successors in the Work of Preaching the Gospell: and it is such a Power, as a meer man may be invested withall. Forgiveneſſe of sins, which we terme *Authoritative*, being an act of *Soveraign* Divine Power, exercised about the *Law*, and *Persons* concerned therein, may be said to be given to Christ two waies. 1. As to the possession of it: And so he hath it from his Father, as God; as he

he hath his Nature, Essence, and Life from him. Whence whatever workes the Father doth, He doth likewise; quicken, as he quickens; Pardon, as he Pardons; as hath been declared. 2. As to the *Execution* of it, for such an end and purpose; as the carrying on of the Work of Mediation committed to him. And so it is *given him* in Commission from the Father, who *sent* him into the World to do his will; and in this sence had *He*, the Son of Man, *power to forgive sins, whilest he was in the Earth.* And to Mr B's Ninth Chapter this may suffice.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of Christs Propheticall Office.

§. 1. THE eighth Chapter in M. *Biddle* is of Christs *Propheticall Office*; or his entrance into a dealing with Christ, in respect of his *Office*, as he hath done with him in respect of his *Person* already.

His first Quest. is. *Is not Christ dignifyed as with the title of Mediatour, so also with that of Prophet.* Ans. Act. 3. 20 22.

§. 2. M. *Biddle* tels us C. 4. that *Christ is dignifyed with the title of God*, though he be *not* so: and here that he is dignifyed with the *Title of a Prophet*, but leaves it at large, whether he were so indeed or no. We are resolved in the case. The first promise made of him by God to *Adam*, was of him, generally as a *Mediatour*, particularly as a *Priest*, as he was to *break the Head of Sathan*, by the *bruising* of his *own heele*. The next solemne renovation of it to *Abraham*, was of him as *King*, taking all nations to be his Inheritance. And the third by *Moses* after the giving of the Law, as a *Prophet*, to teach and instruct his redeemed people. And a *Prophet* he is; the great Prophet of his Church; not only *dignifyed* with that Title, but so he is indeed.

Gen. 3. 15. Col. 2. 15, 16. Gen. 12. 2. Deut. 18. 18.

§. 3. 2. But says M *Biddle*, he is *dignifyed with the title of a Prophet*, as well as of *Mediatour*. As though his being a Prophet were contradistinguished from his being a *Mediatour*. Christs *teaching* of his people is part of the *Mediation* he hath undertaken. All that he doth on their part, in offering *gifts* and *sacrifices* to God

for them, all that he doth on the part of God towards them, by *instructing* and *ruling* of them, He doth, as he is the *Mediatour between God and man*, the *surety* of the Covenant. He is not then a *Mediatour and a Prophet*, but He who is the *Mediatour*, is the *High Priest* and *Prophet* of his Church. Nor are there any acts, that he exerciseth on the one, or other of these accounts, but they are all acts of *his* Mediation, and of *him* as a Mediatour. M. B. indeed tells us not, what he understands by the Mediation of Christ: His Masters so describe it, as to make it all one with his Propheticall Office, and nothing else: Which makes me somewhat to wonder, why this man seemes to distinguish between them.

§. 4. Many more notions of M. *Biddles Masters* are here omitted; as that Christ was not the *Prophet* of his People under the Old Testament, though by his Spirit he preached even to those
1 Pet. 3. 19, 20 that were *disobedient in the dayes of Noah*, and it was the *Spirit of*
1 Pet. 1. 11. *Christ*, that was in all the Prophets of old, whereby God instructed his Church: That he is a Prophet only, because he hath
Isa. 61. 1. Luke 14. 18. John 16. 7, 8, 9, 10. given unto us a *New Law*; though he promise effectually to *open blind eye*, and to send his *Spirit to teach us*, and to lead us into all truth, giving us understanding, that we may know him that
1 John 5. 20. is true. But he layes dirt enough in our way, so that we shall not need farther to rake into the dunghill.

§. 5. 4. I should not have thought that M. *Biddle* could have taken advantage for his *End and purpose* from the place of Scripture he mentions *Act.* 3. 20, 22. *For Moses said truely, a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your Bretheren like unto me*, but that I find him in his next *Querie* repeating that expression [*like unto me*] and wresting of it to be the foundation of a conceit plainly *jocular*. Christ was *like to Moses*, as he was a Prophet, and like to *Aaron*, as he was a Priest, and like to *David*, as he was a *King*. That is, he was represented and *typified*, by all these, & had that likeness to them, which the *Antitype* (as the thing typifyed is usually, but improperly called) hath to the *Type*: But that therefore he must not only be *like them* in the *Generall Office* wherein the correspondency doth consist, but also in all the particular concernments of the Office, as by them administred, is to confound the Type and (the *Antitype*, or rather) thing typifyed. Nor do the words used either by *Moses*, *Deut.*

Deut 18.18. or by *Peter*, *Acts* 3. 22. intimate any such *similitude* or likenesse between Christ and *Moses*, as should extend to such particulars, as are afterwerds intimated. The words of *Peter* are, God shall raise you up a Prophet ὡς ἐμὲ: rather as *he raised up me*, then *like* to me: not the least similitude being intimated between them, but in this, that they were both Prophets and both to be hearkned unto. And so the word used by God to *Moses*: כמוך *sicut tu*, (a Prophet *as thou* art) doth import: I will raise up one that shall be a Prophet, as thou art a Prophet: The likenesse is only in the Office. For such a *similitude* as should give the least occasion to M: *Biddles* following figments there is no colour. And so the whole foundation being rooted up, the tottering superstruction will easily fall to the ground. But then to proceed;

For as much as Christ was to be a Prophet like unto Moses, and Moses had the priviledge above other Prophets, that God made not himselfe known to him in a vision, nor spake to him in a dreame, but face to face, as a man speaketh to his friend, and shewed to him the similitude of the Lord Exod. 33 11. Numb. 12. 6, 7, 8. *Can you tell any passage of Scripture which intimateth, that Christ did see God before the discharge of his Propheticall Office.* Ans. *John* 6. 45, 46. *Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is from God, he hath seen the Father.* §. 6.

1. This passage is indeed very pretty; whether the principles, or the inferences of it are considered. §. 7.

The principles of it are sundry: 1. That God hath a *bodily* *shape*, and similitude, *face*, and *hands*, and the like corporeall Properties. 2. That *Moses* saw the *face* of God, as the face of a man. 3. That Christ was in all things like *Moses*, so that what *Moses* did, He must doe also. Therefore, 1. Christ did see the face of God, as a man: 2. He did it before he entred his *Propheticall Office*; whereunto adde 3. the proofe of all; *no man hath seen the Father, save he which is from God*: That is, Christ *only* saw the *face* of God, and no man else; when the ground of the whole *fiction* is, that *Moses* saw it before him. See Chap. 3. Ἀπὸ εἰκόνος γνωρίζεται, οὐ δαλμοῖς ὄχ ὁρᾶται, ὁδὲ νὶ ἔοικε. *Antiphanes de Deo.*

2. Of the *bodily shape* of God, of *Moses* seeing his face, I have already spoken that, which M: B: will not take out of his way. Of Christs being like *Moses*, something also hath now been delivered. §. 7.

That which *Exod*: 33. 11. in the Hebrew is, פנים אל פנים,

Facie in faciem, ita ut homines cum hominibus colloquentes solent; quod refer ad vocum perceptionem distinctam; non ad conspicuum aliquod: nihil enim viderunt, Grot. Annot. in locum.

panim al panim, the *Septuagint* have rendered ἐνώπιον ἐνωπίῳ, that is, *præsens præsenti*, as one present With him: and the *Chaldee* Paraphrast *verbum ad verbum*. That is, God dealt with him *kindly*, and *familiarly*, not with astonishing terrour; and gave him an intimate acquaintance with his mind and will. And the same expression is used concerning Gods speaking to all the *people*; of whom yet it is expressly said, that they saw no likeness at all: *Deut.* 5.4.

If from the likeness mentioned, there must be a sameness asserted unto the particular attendencys of the discharge of that Office; Then Christ must *divide* the Sea, lift up a *Brazen* Serpent, and *dye* in a Mountaine, and be *buried* by God, where no man could ever know. *Moses* indeed enjoyed an eminency of Revelation above other Prophets, which is called his conversing with God, as a *friend*, and *beholding him face to face*; but even in that wherein he is exalted above all others, he is infinitely short of the *great Prophet* of his Church; for *Moses indeed as a servant was faithfull in all the house of God*, but *this man* is over his house, whose house we are, *Heb.* 3.5,6.

§. 9. 3. This figment is for ever, and utterly everted by the Holy Ghost, *John* 1. 17,18. where he expressly urges a *dissimilitude* between *Moses*, and the *only begotten sonne*, in that particular, wherein this *Gentleman* would have the *likeness* to consist. Herein sayes M. B. is Christ *like* to *Moses*, that as *Moses* saw God *face to face*; so He saw God *face to face*: No saith the Holy Ghost; the *Law* indeed *was given by Moses, but no man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son in the bosome of the Father, he hath declared him.* It is true, that it is said of *Moses*, that God spake to him *face to face*, that is, in a more cleare and familiar manner, then he did to other Prophets; though he told him plainly, that he should not, or *could not see his face*, *Exod.* 33. 18,19. though he gave him some *lower* manifestations of his glory. So that notwithstanding the Revelations made to *him*, no man hath seen God at any time, but the only begotten sonne; He who is of the same *nature* and *Essence* with the Father, & is in his *bosome love*, *He hath seen him*, *Joh* 6.46. & in this doth *Moses*, being a man only, come infinitely short of the *only begotten Sonne*, in that he could never see God, which He did. Which is also asserted in the place of Scripture cited by M. *Biddle*.

4. To

4. To lay this *axe* then also to the *Root* of M.B's. *Tree*, to *cut* it down for the *Fire*; The Foundation of Christs Propheticall Office, as to his knowledge of the will of his Father, which he was to reveale, doth not consist in his *being taken up into Heaven*, and there being taught the will of God in his Humane Nature: but in that He was the only *begotten Sonne of the Father*, who Eternally knew him, and his whole Will and Mind, and in the dispensation which he undertook, revealed him, and his *mind*, according as it was appointed to him. In respect indeed of his Humane Nature, wherein he *declared* and Preached the Will of God, He was *taught of God*, being *filled with Wisdome and Understanding*, by the Spirit, whereto he was anoynted for that purpose; but as the *only begotten Sonne*, in the bosome of the Father, He *alwaies saw him*, knew him, and *revealed* him. §. 10. Luk. 2. 52. Is. 61. 1. Heb. 1. 9.

I shall only adde, that this fancy of M. B. and the rest of the *Socinians*, (*Socinianisme* being indeed a kind of modest and subtle *Mahumedisme*) of Christs seeing God, as did *Moses*, seems to be taken from, or taken up to comply with the *Alcoran*, where the same is affirmed of *Mahomet*. So *Beidavi*, on those words of the *Alcoran*: *Et sunt ex iis quibuscum locutus est ipse Deus*. saith he. *Est hic Moses: aut juxta alios Moses & Mahumed, super quibus Pax: Mosi Deus locutus est ea nocte, qua in exstasi quasi fuit in monte Sinai. Mahumedi vero locutus est illa nocte, qua scalis cœlo admotis, Angelos vidit ascendere, tunc enim vix jactum duarum sagittarum ab eo fuit.* How neer *Moses* came is not expressed; but *Mahomet* came within two bow-shoot of him: how neer the *Socinian* Christ came, I know not, nor doth M. B. informe us. §. 11. *Socinismus est verecundior, aut subtilior* Mahumetismus. *Censemus scripta Socinianorum ad Turcismum proxime accedere.* Censu. Facult. Theol. Leid. An. 1598.

But yet as M. B. *eats* his word, as to *Moses*, and after he had affirmed, that he saw the *face* of God, saies, he only saw the *face* of an *Angell*, so do the Mahumetans also, as to the vision of their Prophet, and tell us, that indeed he was not able to see an Angell in his own proper shape, as *Socinus* says we cannot see a *Spirituall* Body, though M. B. thinks, that we may see Gods *right* hand and his *left*: But of this you have a notable story in *Kessæus*. Saith he: "They report of the Prophet, "that on a certain day (or once upon a time) he "said to *Gabriel*: O *Gabriel* I desire to see thee, "in the forme of thy great shape or figure, "wherein God created thee. *Gabriel* said to him, §. 12.

Tradunt de Propheta, quod die quodam dixerit Gabrieli; O Gabriel, optem te in specie figuræ tuæ magnæ videre, secundum quam Deus creavit te; dixit Gabriel; O dilecte

Deo, est figura mea valde terribilis, nemo eam poterit videre, & sic nec; tu, quin animi deliquium patiatur concidat. reponit Mahumed, etsi maxime ita sit, velim tamen te videre in figura majori. Respondit ergo Gabriel, O dilecte Deo ubi me videre desideras? Extra urbem Meccam respondit Mahumed, in Villa Lapidosa. Dixit Gabriel, valla ista me non capiet; ergo respondit Mahumed, in Monte Orphath. Hic inquit Gabriel locus aptior erit & capacior. Abiit ergo Mahumed in Montem Orphath, & ecce Gabriel, cum magno fragore & strepitu, totum figura sua operiens horizontem, quod cum Propheta vidisset, concidit, deliquiũ passus, in terram. Ubi vero Gabriel, super quo pax, ad priorem rediisset figuram, accessit ad Prophetam, eumq; amplexus & osculatus, ita compellavit: ne timeas O dilecte Deo, sum enim frater tuus Gabriel; Dixit Propheta, vera dixisti, O frater mi Gabriel, nunquam existimassem ullam esse Dei creaturam, tanta præditam figura. Respondit Gabriel, O dilecte Deo, quid si igitur videres figuram Europhil Angeli. Kessius Vit. Patr: p. 12. Interpret. Hotting.

"O beloved of God; my shape is very terrible, no "man can see it, and so not thou, but he will fall "into a swoun: *Mahomet* answered, although it be "so, yet I would see thee in a bigger shape: *Gabri-*"*el* therefore answered; O beloved of God; where "dost thou desire to see mee? *Mahomet* answered, "without the Citty of *Mecca*, in the stony Village; "saies *Gabriel*, that Village will not hold me; "therefore answered *Mahomet*, let it be in Mount "*Orphath*, that is a larger and fitter place saies *Ga-*"*briel*; away therefore went *Mahomet* to Mount "*Orphath*, and behold *Gabriel* with a great noyse "covered the whole Horizon with his shape; "which when the Prophet saw, he fell upon the "earth in a swoune: when therefore *Gabriel*, on "whom be Peace, had returned to his former "shape, he came to the Prophet, and embracing "and kissing him, said to him, Feare not O belo-"ved of God, I am thy brother *Gabriel*. The Pro-"phet answers; thou speakest truly O my brother "*Gabriel*, I could never have thought, that any "creature of God had had such a figure or shape. "*Gabriel* answered, O beloved of God, what "wouldest thou say, if thou sawest the shape of the Angel *Europhil*?

They who know any thing of the *Mahumedan* forgeries and abominations, in applying things spoken of in the Scripture to their Great Impostor, will quickly perceive the composition of this fiction, from what is spoken of *Moses* and *Daniel*. This lying Knave it seems was of M. B's mind, that it was not God indeed, but an Angell, that appeared to *Moses* on Mount *Sinai*; and thence is this Tale, which came to passe once upon a time.

He proceeds.

§. 13. *From whence doth it appeare, that Christ like Moses heard from God the things that he spake?*

Ans.

Anſ. John 8.40. John 8.26,28. Joh.15.15. Joh.14.8.

All the difficulty of this Queſtion ariſeth from thoſe Words, *like Moſes*, and the ſence by M. B. put upon them: how falſly, how inconſiſtently with himſelfe, with what perverting of the Scripture, hath been declared. The Scriptures in the Anſwer affirme only that Chriſt *heard*, and was *taught of the Father*: which is not at all denyed, but only the *modus*, that M. B. would impoſe upon the words, is rejected: Chriſt *heard of the Father*, who taught him as his *Servant*, in the work of his Mediation, by his Spirit, wherewith He was anoynted; but it is his *going into Heaven*, to heare a leſſon with his bodily eares, which M. B. aimes at; and labours under the next *Querie* to prove, how unſucceſſefully ſhall briefly be demonſtrated. Isa.42.1, 19. Phil. 4.7. Isa.52.13. Isa.61.1.

Saith he.

Can you further cite any paſſage to prove, that Chriſt as a man aſcended into Heaven, and was there, and came from God, out of Heaven, before he ſhewed himſelfe to the World, and diſcharged his Propheticall office: So that the talking of Moſes with God, in the perſon of an Angell, bearing the name of God, was but a ſhaddow of Chriſts talking with God? §. 14.

Anſ. John 3 13. Chap 6 38,51. Chap 7. 32,33,41,42, 57, 58. Chap. 8. 29. Chap 13 1,2. Chap. 16. 28, 29, 30. Chap. 17 8.

We are come now to the head of this Affaire; to that which ha's been aimed at all along in the former Querys. The ſumme is: Chriſt untill the time of his Baptiſme, was *ignorant* of the Mind, and Will of God, and knew not what he was to do, or to declare to the World, nor what he came into the World for, at leaſt only in Generall. But then when He was led into the *Wilderneſſe*, to be tempted, He was rapt up into Heaven, and there God inſtructed him in his Mind and Will, made him to know the meſſage that he came to deliver, gave him the Law that he was to promulge, and ſo ſent him down again to the Earth to Preach it. Though the Scripture ſays, that he knew the Will of God, by being his only *begotten Sonne*, full of Grace and Truth, and that he was *full of the Spirit*, when he went to the Wilderneſſe, being by him *anoynted* to Preach the Goſpell; though at his ſolemne entrance ſo to do, the *Heavens* were opened, and the *Holy Ghoſt* deſcended on him in the forme of a Dove, God giving ſolemne Teſtimony to him, and *charge to* §. 15. Smalcius de divin. Chriſti cap. 4. Joh. 1.18. Luk. 4.1. Isa. 61.1. Math. 3. 15, 16, 17.

heare him, yet becauſe M. B's Maſters are not able to anſwer the Teſtimonies of Scripture, for the Divine Nature of Chriſt, which affirme that he *was* in Heaven before his *Incarnation*, and came down to his work, by Incarnation; this figment is ſet on foot to the unſpeakable diſhonour of the Sonne of God. Before I proceed farther in the Examination of this Invention, and detection of its falſhood, that it may appeare, that M. *B.* made not this diſcovery himſelfe, by his *impartiall ſtudy*, (as he reports) of the Scripture, it may not be amiſſe to enquire after the mind of them in this buſineſſe, whoſe Aſſiſtance M. B. ha's in ſome meaſure made uſe of.

§. 16. The *Racovian Catechiſme* gives us almoſt the very ſame *Queſtion* and *Anſwer* (*Unde apparet Chriſtum Dei voluntatem perfecte manifeſtaſſe? Hinc, quod ipſe Jeſus perfectiſſima ratione, eam, a Deo in cœlis ſit edoctus, & Dum hominibus publicandum e cœlo magnifice ſit miſſus, & eam perfecte inſdem annunciavit. Ubi vero Scriptum eſt Chriſtum fuiſſe in cœlo, & a cœlo miſſum.* Joh. 6. 38. Chap. 3. 13. *Catech. Racov. de Offic. Chriſti Prophetico Qu.* 4, 5.) "Whence is it manifeſt, that "Chriſt reveaied the Will of God perfectly unto us? Hence, "becauſe Jeſus himſelfe was in a moſt perfect manner taught "it of God in Heaven, and was ſent from Heaven magnificent-"ly for the publiſhing of it to men, and did perfectly declare "it to them; but where is it written, that Chriſt was in Hea-"ven, and was ſent from Heaven: *Joh.* 6. 38. And ſo, do they proceed with the places of Scripture here cited by M. B. The ſame *Smalcius* ſpends one whole Chap. in his Book of the *Divinity of Chriſt*, whoſe title is, *De initiatione Chriſti ad munus Prophaticum*, to declare and prove this thing; that Chriſt was ſo taken up into Heaven, and there taught the mind of God, (*Smal. de Divin Jeſ. Chriſt: cap.* 4.) only in this he ſeems to be at variance with M. B. that he deny's, that *Moſes* ſaw the *Face* of God, which this man makes the ground of affirming, that Chriſt *did* ſo. But here M. B. is at variance alſo with himſelfe, in the end of the laſt Queſtion, intimating that *Moſes* ſaw only the *Face of an Angell*, that bare the name of God, which now ſerves his turne as the other did before. *Oſtorodus* in his *Inſtitutions Cap.* 16. purſues the ſame buſineſſe with *vehemency*, as the manner of the man was; but *Smalcius* is the Man, who boaſts himſelfe to have *firſt* made the diſcovery; and ſo *he did*, as farre as I can find; or

at

at least, he was the first that fixt the time of this *rapture*, to be when he was in the Wilderneſſe. And saith he, *hoc mysterium nobis a Deo per sacras literas revelatum esse plurimum gaudemus.* (*idem ibid.*) And of all his Companions, this man laies most weight on this Invention: His 8. chap. in the Refutation of *Martinus Smiglecius de verbi incarnat: natur:* is spent in the pursuit of it. So also is a good part of his Book against *Raven Spergerus: Socinus* himselfe ventures at this busineſſe, but so faintly and slightly, as I suppose in all his Writings there is not any thing to be found, wherein he is leſſe *Dogmaticall*; His discourse of it, is in his first Answer to the *Parianesis* of *Volanus*, pag. 38, 39, 40.* One while he sayes the words are to be taken *Metaphorically*; then, that Christ was in Heaven in his mind and Meditation: and at last, it may be *he was taken into Heaven*, as *Paul* was.

* *Aut verba Christi sine ullo prorsus tropo interpretanda sunt, & proinde ex ipsis ducta argumentatio vestra, penitus dissolvetur: aut si tropus aliquis in Christi verbis admittendus est, non videmus, cur non potius dicamus, ideo dixisse Christum filium hominis fuisse in cælo, antequam post resurrectionem eo ascenderet, quia jam ante illud tempus, non modo in cælo mente, & cogitatione perpetuo versabatur, verum etiam omnia cælestia, id est arcana quæq; divinissima, & ipsa omnia quæ in cælo sunt, & fiunt, adeo cognita & perspecta habebat, ut ea tanquam præsentia intueretur: & ita quamvis in terris degens, in ipso tamen cælo commorari dici possit.*

Nam in cælo antequam moreretur revera esse potuit, postquam ex Maria natus est: nec solum potuit, sed (ut ita dicamus) debuit: si enim homo ille Paulus Christi servus, ad tertium usq; cælum ante mortem raptus est, nulle pacto nobis veresimile sit, Christum ipsum ante mortem in cælo non fuisse. Socin. Resp. prior. ad paren. Vol. p. 38, 39, 40.

To returne to our *Catechists*, and to the thing it selfe, the Reader may take of it this briefe account. §. 17.

1. There is indeed in the New Testament abundant mention of our Saviours *coming down from Heaven*, of his coming forth from God, which in what sence it is spoken hath been fully before declared. But of his being *taken up* into Heaven after his Incarnation before his death, and being there *taught the minde* of God, and the Gospell, which he was to preach, there is not one word nor syllable. Can it be supposed, that whereas so many lesser things are not only taken notice of, but also to the *full expressed* with all their circumstances; that this which according to the *Hypothesis* of them with whom we have to doe, is of such importance to the confirmation of his doctrine, and upon a supposition of his being a *meere man*, eminently suited to

the Honour of his Ministry, above all the *Miracles* that he wrought, that He, and all his followers, should be utterly silent therein? That when his doctrine was decried for novelty and folly, and what ever is evill and contemptible, that none of the *Apostles* in its vindication, none of the *Antients* against the *Pagans* should once make use of this *defensative*, that Christ was taken up into *Heaven*, & there instructed in the *mind* of God. Let one word, Testimony, or expression be produced to this purpose, that Christ was *taken up* into Heaven, to be instructed in the minde of God, before his entrance upon his Office, & let our Adversaries take the cause. If not, let this story be kept in the old *Golden Legend*, as a match for any it conteines.

§. 18. 2. There was no cause of this *Rapture* or taking of Christ into Heaven; That which is assigned, that there He might be taught the Gospell, helps not in any measure; For the Scripture not only assignes other causes of his acquaintance with the mind, and Will of God, namely, his *oneneſſe* with the Father, being his only begotten Sonne, his Word, and Wisdome, as also (in respect of his condescention to the Office of Mediation) his being *anointed* with the fulnesse of the Spirit, as was *promised*, and *Propheſied* of him; But also affirmes, that this was accomplished both on him, and towards him, before such time as this *fiction* is pretended to fall out.

John. 1. 18. John 1. 1. Prov. 8. 15, 16, 17, 18. Col. 2. 3. Heb. 1. 9. Iohn 3. 34.

Instantly upon his *baptisme* Luke tells you, that he was πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, *full of the Holy Ghost*, Chap. 4. 1. which was all that was required to give him a full furnishment for his Office, and all that was promised on that account. This answers what he expresses to be necessary for the discharg of his Propheticall Office: πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, is as much as רוח אדני עלי *Isa.* 61. 1. and upon that he sayes, He hath sent me to preach: God also solemnely bare *witneſſe* to him from Heaven, to the same purpose, *Mat.* 3. 17. And before this, *John* affirmes, that he was the *Light of the world*, the *true light*, which *lighteth every man coming into the world* (*Joh.* 1. 9.) which how he should be, and yet himselfe be in darkeneſſe not knowing the will of God, is not easily to be apprehended.

§. 19. 3. To what purpose served all that Glory at his *Baptisme*: that *solemne Inauguration*, when he took upon him the *immediate administration* of his Propheticall Office, in his own person, if after this he

he was to be *taken up into Heaven*, to be taught the minde of God? To what end were the *Heavens opened* over him? To what end did the *Holy Ghost descend upon him in a visible shape*, which God had appointed as a signe, whereby he should be knowne to be the great Prophet *Joh.* 1.32, 35? To what end was that voice from Heaven, *this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased*? I say to what end were all these, if after all this he was *ignorant* of the Gospel, and of the Will of God, and was to be taken up into heaven to be instructed?

§. 20.

4. If this must be supposed to be, without any mention, yet why is it said alway, that Christ *came from heaven* to *the earth*? If he was first on the *earth*, & was taken into *heaven*, & came again to the *earth*, he had spoken to the *understanding* of men. if he had said *I am returned frō Heaven*; & not as he doth, *I am come frō Heaven*. This in lesser matters is observed; Having gone out of *Galilee* to *Jordan* & coming again it is said, he *returned* frō *Jordan*, *Luk.* 4.1. & having been with the *Gadarens*, upon his coming to the other side from whence he went, it is said, he *returned* from the *Gadarens* back againe *Luk* 8. 40. But where is it said that he *returned from Heaven*, which on the supposition that is made, had alone in this case been proper? which propriety of speech is in all other cases every where observed by the holy writers.

διέρχεσθαι. ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν.

5. It is said, that Christ entred *once into the Holy place*, and that having *obtained eternall Redemption*, Heb. 9.12. yea, and expressly that he ought to suffer before he so entred, *Luk.* 24.26. but according to these men, he went twice into Heaven: once *before he suffered*, and had obtained Eternall Redemption, and once afterward. It may also be observed, that when they are pressed to tell us some of the circumstances of this great matter, being *silent* to all other, they only tel us that they conjecture the *Time* to be in the space of that *forty days*, wherein he was in the *wildernes*; on purpose through the Righteous *judgement* of God to entangle themselves in their own imaginations, the Holy Ghost affirming expressly, that he was the *whole forty days in the Wildernesse*, amongst the *wild beasts*, Mark. 1.13.

Smalcius de divin. Christ. cap 4.

Καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα.

§. 21.

Enough being said to the disprovement of this fiction, I shall very briefely touch upon the *sence* of the places, that are produced to give countenance thereunto. In most of the places insisted on, there is this expression. *He that came down from Heaven*,

or, *I came down from Heaven*, so Joh. 6.32,33,38,41,42,51,57,58. Joh. 3.30,31,32. hence this is the Conclusion; If our Saviour *came down from Heaven*, then after he had lived some time in the world he was *taken up* into Heaven, there to be taught the minde of God: He that hath a mind to grant this consequence, is willing to be these *mens Disciple*. The Scripture gives us another account of the intendment of this phrase. Namely, that the *Word was with God*, and the *Word was God*, and the *word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us*, and his glory was seen, as the glory of the only begotten Sonne of God; so that it is not a *locall descension*, but a *gratious condescension*, that is intimated, with his voluntary humiliation, when he who was in the forme of God humbled himselfe to take upon him the *forme of a Servant*, therein to learne obedience. So that these expressions yeild very little reliefe to our Adversarie.

Joh. 1.1,2, 14.

§. 22. 2. The second sort are those, wherein He is said to come *forth from God*, or *from the Father*; this is expressed. *Joh.* 3: 42. *Joh.* 13.1,3. *Joh.* 16.28,29,30. *Joh.* 17.3. *Joh.* 16.27. from whence an Argument of the same importance with the former, doth arise. If Christ *came from God, from the Father*, then after he had been *many years* in the world, he was taken into Heaven, and there taught the Gospell, and sent againe into the world. With such invincible demonstrations do these men contend. That Christ came from God, from the Father, that is, had his Mission and Commission from God, as he was Mediatour, the great Prophet, Priest, and King of his Church, none denyes, and this is all that in those places is expressed. Of which afterwards.

§. 23. 3 Some particular places are yet remaining. The first is Joh. 3.13. *No man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that came downe from Heaven, the Sonne of man which is in Heaven.* That, *which is*, M. B. renders rather, *which was*: whether with greater prejudice to his cause, or conscience I know not. To his cause, in that he manifests, that it cannot be defended without corrupting the word of God: To his Conscience, by corrupting it to serve his own ends and turne accordingly. The words are, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, which will by no meanes admit of his corrupting glosse.

I say then, let the words speake themselves, and you need no

no other to cut the throat of the whol cause, that this man hath undertaken to mannage. He that speakes is the Sonne of man, and all the time of his speaking he was in Heaven. *He* (saith he) *is in Heaven*: in his *humane Nature* he was then on the Earth, not in Heaven; therefore he had another *nature*, wherein at that Time he was in Heaven also; He who *was* so, being the Sonne of man; and what then becomes of M. B's Christ? And what need of the Rapture whereof he speakes.

For the *Ascending into Heaven*, mentioned in the beginning of the verse, that it cannot be meant of a *locall ascent* of Christ in his humane nature, antecedent to his *Resurrection*, is evident, in that he had not yet *descended into the lower parts* of the earth, which he was to do before his *locall ascent*. Eph. 4. 9, 10. The *ascent* there mentioned, answers the discourse that our *Saviour* was then upon, which was to enforme *Nicodemus* in Heavenly things; To this end he tells him (*v.* 12.) that they were so slow of Believing that they could not receive the plainest Doctrine, nor understand even the visible things of the Earth, as the *blowing of the winde*, nor the causes, and issue of it: much lesse did they understand the *Heavenly* things of the *Gospel*, which none (saith he, *v.* 13.) hath pierced into, is acquainted withall, *hath ascended into Heaven*, in the knowledge of, but he who *is* in *Heaven*, and is sent of God into the world to instruct you. He *who is in Heaven* in his Divine nature, who is come down from Heaven, being sent of God, having taken *flesh*, that he might *reveale*, and *do* the will of God, He, and none but he, hath *so ascended into Heaven*, as to have the full knowledge of the Heavenly things whereof I speake. Of a *Locall ascent* to the end and purpose mentioned, there is not the least syllable. §. 24.

Thus I say the context of the Discourse seemes to exact a *metaphoricall* interpretation of the words: our Saviour in them informing *Nicodemus* of his acquaintance with Heavenly things, whereof he was ignorant. But yet the propriety of the word may be observed without the least advantage to our Adversaries; For it is evident, that the words are *eclipticall*; οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός. *ascend*, must be repeated againe to make the sence compleat: and why may not, μέλλει ἀναβῆναι be inserted, as well as ἀναβέβηκε. So are the words rendred §. 25. Οὐδεὶς τῶν προφητῶν ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ μέλλω ἀναβῆναι, καὶ κατῆλθον. Theoph. in loc.

rendred by *Theophilact*: and in that sence relate not to what was *before*, but what was *to be*. And an instance of the necessity of an alike *supplement*, is given in Math. 11.27. moreover some suppose, that ἀναβέβηκεν, affirming the want of a potentiall conjunction, as ἄν, or the like, (which the following exceptives εἰ μὴ, require) in the place, is not to be taken for the *act* don, but for the *power* of doing it: of which examples may be given: So that the *propriety* of the word may also be preserved, without the least countenance afforded to the *figment* under consideration.

§. 26. The remaining place is, Joh. 6.62. *What and if you shall see the Sonne of man ascending up where he was before:* ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον. That Christ was in Heaven before his *locall ascent* thither in his humane nature, is part of our plea to prove his *divine nature*, and what will thence be obtained I know not.

And this is the first Attempt that these *Gentlemen* make upon the *Propheticall Office* of Christ; He did not know the will of God, as the *only begotten Sonne of the Father in his bosome*; He was not furnished for the declaring of it, in his own immediate Ministry, by the unction of the Holy Ghost, and his being filled therewith; He was not solemnely inaugurated thereunto by the glorious presence of the Father, and Holy Ghost with him, one in a *voyce*, the other in a *bodily shape*, bearing witnesse to him, to be the Prophet sent from God; but being for many yeares ignorant of the Gospell, and the will of God, or what he came into the world to do, He was, no man knowes *where*, *when*, nor *how*, rapt into Heaven, and there taught and instructed in the mind of God, (as *Mahomet* pretended he was also,) and so *sent* into the world, *after* he had been *sent* into the world many a yeare.

§. 27. Here the *Racovians* adde.

Quæ vero est illa voluntas Dei per Iesum nobis patefacta? — *What is that will of God which by Christ is revealed?*

Resp. *Est illud fœdus novum quod cum genere humano Christus nomine Dei pepigit, unde etiam Mediator novi fœderis vocatur*: Heb. 8.6. 1 Tim. 2.5. — *It is the new Covenant, which Christ, in the name of God, made with humane kind, whence also he is called the Mediatour of the new Covenant.* Catech. Rac. de Prophet. mun. Christi.

☞ It seemes then that Christ was taken into Heaven, to be taught the *new Covenant*, of which before he was *ignorant*; though

though the very *name* that was given him before he was borne contained the substance of it: *Math.* 1.21. (2.) Christ did not make the Covenant with us as Mediatour; but confirmed & ratifyed it: *Heb.* 9.15,16,17. God gave him in the *Covenant* which he made; and therefore is said to give him for a Covenant, *Isa.* 42.6. (3.) The Covenant of Grace is not made with all *mankind*, but with the *seed* of the woman: *Gen* 3 15. *Gal.* 3 16. *Rom.* 9.7,8. (4.) Christ is not called the Mediatour of the Covenant, because he declared the will of God concerning it, but because he gave his life a *Ransome* for those with whom it is made, 1 *Tim* 2.5,6. and the promises of it were confirmed in his bloud, *Heb.* 9.15. *ch.* 10.16 28. (5.) This covenant was not first made, & revealed, when Christ taught it in his own Person. It was not only *made*, but *confirmed to Abraham* in Christ 430. yeares before the Law, *Gal.* 3. 17. yea ever since the entrance of sinne, no man hath *walked* with God but in the same Covenant of Grace: as elsewhere is declared.

Let us see what followes in M.B. says he. §. 28.

You have already shewed that Christ was like unto Moses, in seeing God, and hearing from him the things which he speake, but Moses exceeded all other Prophets likewise in that he only was a Law giver; was Christ therefore like unto Moses in giving of a Law also, and is there any mention of this Law. Ans. Gal. 6.2. *fulfill the Law of Christ* Rom. 3. 27. *by the Law of Faith*, Jam. 2. 12. *by the Law of liberty*, Jam. 1. 25.

That *Moses* did not see the face of God hath been shewed, and M. *Biddle confesseth* the same. That Christ was not *rapt* into Heaven for any such end or purpose as is pretended, that He is not compared to *Moses* as to his initiation into his *Propheticall Office*, that there is no one word in the Scripture giving countenance to any of these figments hath been evinced. Nor hath M. *Biddle shewed* any such thing to them, who have their sences *exercised* to discerne *good and evill*; what apprehensions soever his *Catechumens* may have of his skill and proofes.

2. What is added to this question will be of an easy dispatch. The word [*Law*] may be considered generally, as to the nature of it, in the sence of Scripture, for a Revelation of the mind of God; and so we say Christ did give a *Law*, in that he revealed fully and clearely the whole minde of God, as to our §. 29.

Salvation and the Obedience he requireth of us. And so there is a *Law* of Faith; that is, *a doctrine of Faith*, opposite to the *Law*, as to its *Covenant* ends *simply* so called. And he also instituted some peculiar significant Ceremonies, to be used in the worship of God; pressing in particular in his teaching, and by his example the duty of love, which thence is particularly called a *new Commandement*, and the *Law of Christ*, Gal. 6. 2. even that which he did so eminently practice: As he was a Teacher, a Prophet come out from God, He taught the minde, and will, and worship of God; from his own *bosome* Joh. 1. 18. Heb. 1. 1. And as he was, & is the King of his *Church*, he hath given *precepts* and Lawes, and Ordinances, for the Rule and goverment thereof, to which none can adde, nor from them may detract. But take the word *Law*, *strictly*, in reference to a *Covenant* end, that He which performes it shall be *justifyed* by his performance thereof; So we may say, he gave the *Law originally* as God, but as Mediatour he gave no *such Law*, or *no Law* in that sence, but revealed fully and clearely our *justification* with God upon another Account; and gave no new precepts of Obedience, but what were before given in the Law, written Originally in the heart of man by nature, and delivered to the *Church* of the *Jewes* by *Moses* in the Wilderneſſe; of which in the chapter of *Justification*.

§. 30. For the places quoted by M. *Biddle*, that of *Gal.* 6. 2. *Beare one anothers burthen, and fullfill the* Law *of Christ*, speakes only of that one command of *brotherly love* and forbearance; which is called peculiarly, as I said, a *new commandment*, though the *Jewes* had it from the *beginning*; and the *Law of Christ*, because of the eminent accomplishment of it by him, *who loved us, and gave himself for us*, transmitting it anew to us, with such new motives, and inducements, as it had not received before, nor ever shall againe. The Law of Faith mentioned *Rom.* 3. 27. is no more but the Doctrine of the Gospell, and of Justification without the workes of the Law, that is, all workes commanded by what *Law* soever: as the whole doctrine of the word of God is called the Law, neere an hundred times in the *Psalmes*. The *law of Faith* is that which is opposed to the *law of workes*, as a meanes of obtaining Righteousneſſe, which is not by obedience to *new* Commands.

The

The places in *Ja.*2.12. *Ja.*1.25. speak directly of the Morall Law, which is manifest by that particular annumeration of its precepts, which we have subjoyned, v.13,14.

3. But M. *Biddles* Masters have a farther reach in the asserting Christ to have given a *new Law*: namely, whereas they place *Justification* as a *Consequent* of our own obedience, and observing how impossible it is to doe it, on the Obedience yielded to the *Morall Law*, the Apostle having so frequently, & expressly decryed all possibility of *Justification* thereby, they have therefore faigned to themselves, that Christ Jesus hath given a *New Law*, in Obedience whereunto we may be justifyed; which when they attempt to prove, it will be needfull for them to produce other manner of evidences, then that hereby M. B. insisted on which speakes not one word to the purpose in hand: But that this is the intendment of the man is evident from his ensuing discourse. §. 31.

Having reckoned up the *Expositions* of the Law, and its *vindication* given by our Saviour *Math.* 5. in the next *Querie*, he calls them very ignorantly the *Law of Faith*, or the *New Covenant*. If M. B. knowes no more of the New *Covenant*, but that it is a New Law given by our Saviour Mat.5.6,7. (as upon other accounts) I pitty the man: He proceeds.

Doth not Christ then partly perfect, partly correct the Law of Moses, what is the determination of Christ concerning this matter. Math.5.21, 22,23,24. §. 32.

1. The reason of this Querie, I acquainted the Reader with before. These men seeking for a Righteousnes as it were by the *workes of the Law*, and not daring to lay it upon that, which the Apostle doth expresly so often reject, they strive to relieve themselves with this; that our *Saviour* hath so dealt with the Law as here is expressed; so that to yeild obedience to it now as *mended, perfected, and reformed*, must needs be sufficient to our *justification*. Ὡς ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, Rom. 9. 32.

2. Two things are here affirmed to be done by the Lord Christ, in reference to the *Law of Moses*, as it is called; that is, the *Morall Law*, as is evident by the following instances, given to make good the Assertion; first that he *perfects* it, secondly that he *corrects* it; and so a double imputation is laid on the §. 33.

Law of God. 1. Of *Imperfection.* 2. Of *Corruption,* that needed Amendment or Correction.

§. 34. Before I proceed to examine the particular instances, whereby the man attempts to make good his insinuation, the Honour of *God,* and his *Law,* requires of us, that it be vindicated from this double Calumny, and demonstrated to be neither *imperfect,* nor to stand in need of *correction.*

For its perfection we have the Testimony of God himselfe expresly given thereunto, Psal. 19. 7. *The Law of the Lord is* PERFECT *converting the Soul.* It is the *perfect Law of liberty,* Jam. 1. 25. Yea so *perfect,* as that God hath forbidden any thing to be added to it, or to be taken from it *Deut.* 4. 1, 2. *Deut.* 12. 32.

§. 35. 2. If the Law wants *Perfection,* it is in respect of its *essentiall* parts, or its *integrall* parts, or in respect of *degrees.* But for its Rom. 7. *essentiall* parts it is *perfect,* being in matter, and forme, in sence, and sentence, *Divine, Holy, Just, Good.* For its *Integrals,* it comprises the whole *Duty of man* Eccles. 12. and the last; which *doing* he was to *live;* And for the *degrees* of its commands, It requireth that we *love the Lord our God with all our hearts, and all our soules, and our neighbours as our selves;* which our Saviour confirmes as a *Rule of perfection.* Math. 22. 37.

§. 36. 3. If the Law of God was not *perfect,* but needed *correction* it is either because God *could not,* or *would not* give a perfect and compleat Law: To say the first, is *Blasphemy:* for the latter, theres no pretence for it. God giving a Law for his Service, proclaiming his *wisdome* and *Holinesse* to be therein, and that if any man did performe it, he should live therein, certainely would not give such a Law, as by its imperfection should come short of any of the ends and purposes, for which it was appointed.

§. 37. 4. The *perfection* of the Law is hence also evinced; that the precepts of Christ wherein our obedience requires us to be perfect, are the *same,* and *no other* then the precepts of the Law: his *new commandment* of love is also an *old* one, 1 *John* 2. 7, 8. which Christ calls his *new command,* Joh. 13. 34. and the like instances might be multiplyed, neither will the instance of M. B. evince the contrary which he argues from *Mat* 5. for that Christ doth not in that *chapter correct* the *Law,* or adde any new precept.

cept thereunto, but expounds and vindicates it from the corrupt Glosse of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, appeares,

1. From the *Occasion* of the discourse, and the Proposition which our Saviour makes good, establisheth, and confirmeth therein: which is laid down *v.* 21. *Except your righteousnesse exceed the righteousnesse of the Scribes and Pharisees, you cannot enter into the Kingdome of Heaven.* In pursuit of this proposition, He manifesteth what their *Righteousnesse* was, by examining their *Catechisme* upon the *Commandements*, and the Exposition they made therein of them. It is not the Righteousnesse of the Law that our Saviour *rejects*, and requires more in his Disciples, but that of the *Pharisees* whom he every where called Hypocrites: But for the Law he tells them a *Tittle of it shall not passe away*, & he that keepes it shall be called *great*, or be of great esteeme in the *Kingdome of God*: and the good workes, that our Saviour then required in his Disciples, are no other but those that were commanded in the Law. § 33.

2. The very *Phraseology*, and manner of speech here used by our Saviour, manifests of *whom*, and concerning *what* he speaks; *you have* HEARD *that it was* SAID *to them of old time*; you have *heard*, not you have *read*; you have *heard it of the Scribes and Pharisees*, out of *Moses* chaire they have *told* you, that it was thus *said*; and you have heard that it was SAID to them of Old; not that it was *written*, that it was *written* in *the Law*, the *Expression* whereby he citeth what was *written*. And it was said *to them of Old*: the common pretence of the *Pharisees* in the imposing their *Traditions*, and Expositions of the Law. It is the *tradition of the Elders*, it was said to them by such and such *blessed Masters of old*. § 39.

3. Things are instanced in, that are *no where* written in the Law, nor ever were: as that, *thou shalt love thy Neighbour, and hate thine enemy*: which is so remote from the Law, as that the contrary is directly commanded, *Levit* 19 18. *Exod.* 23. 4, 5. *Prov.* 21. 21, 22. To them who gave this Rule, *thou shalt love thy Neighbour, and hate thine enemy*, *doth Christ oppose himselfe*. But those were the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* in their corrupt Glosses, from which Gods Law is *vindicated*, not in its selfe before *corrupted*. § 40.

4. Whose *sayings* Christ rejects, their *sayings* He did not come to fulfill; But he came to *fulfill* and accomplish the *Law*, and

Math. 5. 17. therefore it is not the *Law*, and the sentence thereof, that he rejects in that forme of speech, *but I say unto you.*

§. 41. Before I come to the consideration of the particular instances given by M.B. a briefe Consideration of what is offered to this purpose by *Smalcius*, in his *Racovian Catechisme*, may be premised. His first Chapter about the *Propheticall Office* of Christ, is *de præceptis Christi, quæ legi addidit*, Of the Precepts of Christ, which he added to the Law. And therein this is his first Question and Answer.

Quænam sunt perfecta mandata Dei per Christum tradita?

What are the Perfect commands of God, revealed by Christ?

Pars eorum continetur in præceptis a Mose traditis, una cum iis, quæ sunt eis in novo fœdere addita. Pars vero continetur in iis, quæ peculiariter ipse Christus præscripsit.

"Part of them is contained in the Precepts given by *Moses*, with those which are added thereunto in the New Covenant: part is contained in those things, which Christ himselfe prescribed.

The commands of God, revealed by Jesus Christ, are here referred to three heads. 1. The Ten *Commandements* given by *Moses*: for so that part is explained in the next Question, where they are said to be the Decalogue. 2. The additions made by Christ thereunto. 3. His own peculiar institutions.

§. 42. As to the first, I desire only to know how the *ten Commandements* were revealed by Jesus Christ. The Catechist confesseth that they were given to *Moses*, and revealed by that means; how are they then said to be revealed by Christ: if they shall say, that he may be said to reveale them, because he promulged them anew, with new *Motives*, *Reasons*, *and Encouragements*, I hope he will give us leave to say also, that what he calls a *new Commandement*, is not so termed in respect of the *matter of it*, but its new enforcement by Christ: we grant Christ revealed that Law by *Moses*, with its new Covenant Ends, as he was the great Prophet of his Church, by his Spirit, from the foundation of the World; but this *Smalcius* denyes.

§. 43. 2. That Christ made no new additions to the Morall Law, hath been partly evidenced from what hath been spoken concerning the *perfection thereof*, with the intention of our Saviour in that place, and those things wherein they say *these additions* are found and do consist; and shall yet farther be evinced, from the consideration of the particulars by them instanced in.

3.

3. It is granted, that our blessed Saviour did for the times of the New Testament institute the two Ordinances of *Baptisme* and the *Lords Supper*, in the roome of them, which together with their representation of the *benefits*, which Believers receive by him, did also prefigure him as to come. But 1. these are no new Law, nor part of a new Law, with a Law designe in them. 2. Though there is an *obedience* in their performance yeilded to God & Christ, yet they belong rather to the *Promise*, then the Precepts of Christ; to our *privilege*, before unto our *duty*. §. 44.

In the progresse of that *Catechist*, after some discourse about the *Ceremoniall* and *Judiciall* Law, with their abolition, and his allowance of Magistrates among Christians notwithstanding, (which they do, upon condition he shed no blood for any cause whatever) He attempts in particular, to shew what Christ added to the Morall Law, in the severall Precepts of it. And to the first he saies, that Christ added two things. 1. In that he prescribed us a certain forme of Prayer; of which afterwards in the Chapter designed to the consideration of what Mr B speaks to the same purpose. 2. That we acknowledge himselfe for God, and Worship him; of which also in our discourse of the *Kingly Office* of Christ. To the Second, he saies, is added in the New Testament, not only, that we should not worship *Images*, but avoid them also; which is so notoriously false, the avoiding of Images of our own making, being no lesse cõmanded in the *Old Testament*, then in the *New*, that I shall not insist thereon. The residue of his *plea* is the same with M. B's from *Mat.* 5. where what they pretend shall be considered in order. §. 45.

To consider then briefely the particular Instances: The first is in reference to the Sixth Commandement, *Thou shalt not Kill*. This the *Pharisees* so interpreted, as that if a man kept himselfe from *blood*, and from causing the *death of another*, He was Righteous, as to the keeping of this Commandement. Our Saviour lets his Disciples know, that there is a *closer*, and nearer fence of this Law: *I say unto you*, in the Exposition of this Commandement, *that any rash anger, anger without a cause*, all offence given, proceeding from thence, in light vilifying expressions, such as *Racha*, much more all provoking taunts and reproaches, as *thou fool*, are forbidden therein, so as to render a man obnoxious to the judgement of God, and condemnation in their §. 46.

See a full and cleare exposition of this place by D. *Lightfoot*, in his *Preface* to the *Harmony* of the Gospell.

severall

severall *degrees of sinfulnesse*; as there were amongst themselves severall Councells, according to severall Offences; the *judgement*, the *Councell*, and *utter cutting off*, as a child of Hell. Hence then having manifested the least breach of Love and Charity towards our Brother to be a breach of the Sixth Commandement, and so to render a man *obnoxious* to the *judgement* of God, in severall degrees of sinne, according as the eruptions of it are, he proceeds in the following verses to exhort his Disciples to *Patience*, *Forbearance*, and *Brotherly Love*, with readinesse to Agreement and Forgivenesse, verses 20,21,22,23,24,25,26.

§. 47. 2. In the next place, he proceeds to the vindication, and Exposition of the *Seventh Commandement*, v. 27. *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*: which the *Pharisees* had so expounded, as that if a man kept himselfe from *Actuall uncleannesse*, however he lived *loosely*, and put away *his Wife at his Pleasure*, he was free from the breach thereof. To give them the true meaning, and Sence of this *Commandement*, and farther to discover the *hypocrisy* of the *Pharisees*, he lets them know;

1. That the *Concupiscence* of the Heart, and inordinate desire of any Person, is the *Adultery* here no lesse forbidden, then that of *actuall uncleannesse*, which the Law made death. And certainly, he must needs be as *blind* as a *Pharisee*, who sees not, that the *uncleannesse of the Heart*, and Lust after Women, was forbidden by the Law, and under the Old Testament.

2. As to their *living* with their Wives, he mentions indeed the words of *Moses*, whosoever *shall put away his Wife, let him give her a Bill of Divorcement*; but oppoeth not himselfe thereunto at all, but only shewes, that, that *permission of Divorce* is to be interpreted according to the Rule and Instruction given in the first Institution of *Marriage*, (as afterward, on another occasion he explains himselfe *Math* 19.) And not that men might therefore for every cause, that they would, or could pretend, instantly put away their Wives, as the *Pharisees* taught men to do; And as *Josephus*, one of them testifies of himselfe, that he did. *I put away my Wife* (saith he) *because she did not please me.* No, saith our Saviour, that permission of *Moses* is not to be extended beyond the *just cause* of divorce, as it is by the Pharisees, but made use of only in the case of *Fornication*, v. 27,28. And thereupon descends to caution his Disciples, to be carefull and circumspect

circumspect in their walking in this particular, and not be led by an offending eye, or hand, (the beginning of evill,) to greater Abominations.

§. 48. 3. In like manner doth he proceed in the vindication of the *third Commandement*; The *Scribes* and *Pharisees* had invented, or approved of *Swearing by Creatures*, the *Temple*, *Altar*, *Hierusalem*, the *Head*, and the like; and thereupon raised many wicked and cursed distinctions, on purpose to make a cloake for *hypocrisy*, and *lying*, as you may see *Matth.* 23.16, 17, 18. If a man sweare by the *Temple*, it is nothing; he is not bound by his Oath; but if he sweare by the *Gold* of the Temple, he is obliged. In like manner did they distinguish of the *Altar*, and the *Gift*; and having mixed these swearings, and distinctions, in their *ordinary conversations*, there was nothing sincere, or open, and plaine, left amongst them. This wicked glosse of theirs (being such as their *successors* abound withall to this day) our blessed *Saviour* decry's; and commands his *Disciples* to use *plainenesse*, and *simplicity* in their conversation, in plain Affirmations, and Negations, without the mixture of such profane, and cursed execrations, v. 34, 35, 36, 37. which that it was no new duty, nor unknown to the Saints of the Old Testament, is known to all that have but read it.

§. 49. 4. In matter of *Judgement between man and man*, he proceeds in the same manner; because the *Law* had appointed the *Magistrate* to exercise *talionem* in some cases, and to take an *eye* for an *eye*, and a *tooth* for a *tooth*, the blind *Pharisees* wrested this to countenance *private* men in *revenging* themselves, and pursuing them who had injur'd them with an *hostile* mind, at least untill the sentence of the Law was executed on them. To root out the rancour and malice of the minds of Men, which by this means were nourished, and fomented in them, our Saviour lets them know, that notwithstanding that proceedure of the Magistrate by the Law, yet indeed all *private revenges* were forbidden, and *all readinesse* to contend with others: which he amplifieth in the proposall of some particular cases; and all this by vertue of a Rule, which himselfe affirmes to be contained in the Law; *Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy selfe*, v. 38, 39, 40, 41, 42. pressing also *lending*, and *giving*, as works of charity, whereunto a blessing is so often pronounced in the Old Testament.

§. 50. 5. His last instance is in the matter of *Love*, concerning which the *Pharisees* had given out this note; *Thou shalt Love thy Neighbour, and Hate thine Enemy.* For whereas there were certain *Nations* whom God had appointed to utter destruction; at his peoples first coming into *Canaan*, he commanded them to shew them no mercy, but utterly to destroy them, *Deut.*7.2. This the wretched *Hypocrites* laid hold of, to make up a Rule, and Law for private men to walke by, in reference to them, whom they accounted their Enemies, in expresse contradiction to the command of God, *Ex.*23.4,5. *Levit.* 19.18. Wherefore our blessed Saviour vindicates the sence of the Law from this cursed *Tradition* also, and renews the precept of *loving*, and *doing good* to our Enemies, v.43,44,45. So that in none of the instances mentioned, is there the least evidence of what was proposed to be confirmed by them, namely, that our Saviour *gave a new Law*, in that he did *partly perfect*, partly *correct* the Law of *Moses*; seeing he did only vindicate the *sence* and *meaning* of the Law, in *sundry precepts* thereof, from the false Glosses and Traditions of the Scribes and Pharisees, invented and imposed on their Disciples, to be a cloak to their *hypocrisy* and wickednesse. And this also may fully suffice to remove what on this account is delivered by the *Racovian Catechisme*. But on this foundation M. B. proceeds.

§. 51. *You have made it appeare plainly that the Law of Faith, or the New Covenant, whereof Christ was the Mediator, is better then the Law of Workes, or the Old Covenant, whereof Moses was the Mediator in respect of Precepts, is it also better in respect of Promises? A.* Heb:8.6. Heb.7.19.

This is indeed a *comfortable* passage, for the better understanding whereof I shall *single* out the severall noble Propositions, that are insinuated therein, and evidently contained in the words of it: as

§. 52. 1. Christ was the Mediator of the *Law of Faith*, the new Law, in the same sence as *Moses* was Mediator of the *Old Law*, the Law of Workes.

2. Christs Addition of Precepts and Promises to the *Law of Moses*, is the *Law of Faith*, or the *New Covenant*.

3. The People, or the Church of the Jewes, lived under the *Old Covenant*, or the Law of Workes: whereof *Moses*, not Christ was the Mediator.

4. The difference between the *Old*, and the *New Covenant*, lyes

lyes in this; that the New hath more *Precepts* of Obedience, and more *Promises* then the Old.

And now truly he that thinks, that this man understands either the *Old Covenant*, or the *New*, either *Moses*, or *Christ*, either *Faith*, or *Workes*, shall have liberty from me to enjoy his opinion, for I have not more to adde, to convince him of his mistake, then what the man himselfe hath here delivered. §. 53.

For my part, I have much other *work* to do, occasioned by M. B. and therefore I shall not here divert to the consideration of the *two Covenants*, and their *difference*, with the *twofold Administration* of the Covenant of Grace, both before, and after Christs coming in the flesh; but I shall content my selfe with some briefe Animadversions upon the forementioned Propositions, and proceed.

1. In what sence Christ is the *Mediatour of the new Covenant*, I shall (God assisting) at large declare, when I come to treat of his death, and satisfaction; and shall not here prevent my selfe in any thing of what must then, and there, be delivered. §. 54.

2. That there are precepts, and Promises attending the new Covenant, is granted; but that it consists in any addition of precepts to the *Mosaicall* Law, carryed on in the same tenour with it, with other promises, is a figment directly destructive of the whole Gospell, and the mediation of the Sonne of God. By this meanes the whole undertaking of Jesus Christ, to lay downe his Life a Ransome for us, our justification by his blood, his being *of God made Righteousnesse to us*, the free pardon of our sinnes, and Acceptation with God, by, and for him, as he is the end of the Law for righteousnesse, all communication of effectuall grace, to worke in us new Obedience, the giving of a new *cleane heart*, with the Law of God written in it by the Spirit, in a word, the whole promise made to *Abraham*, the whole *new Covenant*, is excluded from the Covenant, and men left yet in their sinnes. The Covenant of workes was, *doe this and live*, and the tenour of the Law, *if a man do the things thereof, he shall live thereby*; that is, if a man by his own strength performe, and fulfill the Righteousnesse that the Law requires, he shall have Eternall Life thereby. This Covenant saith the A-

Heb. 8. postle, God hath disanulled, because no man could be saved by it: The Law thereof through sinne was become *weake*, and Rom. 8. 3. *insufficient* as to any such end and purpose; what then doth God substitute in roome thereof: why a *new Covenant*, that hath more precepts added to the old, with all those of the Old continued, that respected Morall Obedience. But is this a remedy? Is not this rather a new burthen? If the Law could not save us before, because it was impossible through sinne that we should perfectly accomplish it, and therefore by the *deeds of the Law shall no man be justifyed*: Is it a likely way to relieve us, by making an addition of more *precepts* to them, which before we could not observe? But that through the Righteous hand of God, the interest of mens immortall soules is come to be concerned therein; I should think the time exceedingly lavish't, that is spent in this Discourse. Let him that is ignorant, be ignorant still, were a sufficient answer. And this that hath been said, may suffice to the fourth particular also.

§. 55. 3. That *Moses* was a Mediator of a *Covenant of workes*, properly, & formally so called, & that the *Church* of the *Jews* lived under a Covenant of workes, is a no lesse pernitious figment then the former. The Covenant of workes was, *'do this and live'*; on perfect obedience you shall have life. Mercy, and pardon of sinnes were utter strangers to that Covenant, and therefore by it the Holy Ghost tells us, that no *man could be Saved*. The Church of old had the *Promises of Christ*, Rom. 9. 5. Gen. 3. 15. Chap. 12. 3. were *justifyed by Faith*, Gen. 15. 6. Rom. 4. Gal. 3. obtained Mercy for their sinnes, and were *justifyed in the Lord*, Isa. 42. 24. had the *Spirit for conversion, Regeneration, and Sanctification*, Ezek. 11. 19. Chap. 36. 26. expected, and obtained Salvation by *Jesus Christ*: things as remote from the *Covenant of Workes* as the *East* from the *West*.

It is true, the *Administration* of the Covenant of Grace, which they lived under, was *darke, legall*, and *low*, in comparison of that, which we now are admitted unto, since the comming of Christ in the flesh; but the covenant wherein they walked with God, and that wherein we find acceptance, is the same; Rom. 4. 4, 5. and the Justification of *Abraham* their Father, the patterne of ours.

§. 56. Let us now see what answer M. B. Applyes to his Querie: The

The first text he mentions is, Heb. 8. 6. *But now hath he obtained a more excellent Ministry, by how much also he is the Mediatour of a better Covenant, built upon better promises.* That which the Holy Ghost here affirmes, is, that the *New Covenant*, whereof Christ is the Mediatour, is *better then* the *Old*; and that it hath better *Promises*: which I suppose none ever doubted. The Covenant is *better*, seeing that could by no meanes save us, which by this Christ doth to the uttermost. The *promises* are better, for it hath innumerable promises of *Conversion*, *Pardon*, and *Perseverance*, which that had not at all; and the promise of Eternall life, which that had, is given upon infinitely better, and surer, termes. But all this is nothing at all to M. B's purpose.

No more is the second place which he mentioneth, Heb. 7. 19. *The Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did.* §. 57.

Not that by the *Law*, in that place, the *Covenant of workes* is intended, but the *legall Administration* of the Covenant of Grace. This saith the Apostle, *made nothing perfect*; men were kept under *Types*, and *Shaddowes*, and though they were Children of God by Adoption, yet in comparison, they were kept as *servants*, being under Age untill the fullnes of time came, when the *bringing in of Jesus Christ, that better hope*, made the Administration of Grace perfect, and compleat. Mr B. all along *obscures* himselfe under the ambiguous terme of the *Law*; confounding its *covenant* & *subsequent* use; For the *Covenant use* of the *Law*, or as it was the tenour of the *Covenant* of workes, the Saints of the Old Testament were no more concerned in it, then are we. The Subsequent use of it, may be considered two waies. 1. As it is *purely Morall*, exacting perfect Obedience, and so the use of it is common to them and us. 2. As attended with *ceremoniall and judiciall* institutions in the Administration of it, and so it was peculiar to them: And this one observation will lead the Reader through much of the Sophistry of this Chapter, whose next Question is. Gal. 4.

Were those better promises of God touching Eternall Life, and immortality hidden in the darke, and not brought to light under the Law? §. 58.

Ans. *Christ Jesus hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospell:* 2 Tim. 1. 10.

The whole ambiguity of this Question lyes in those expressi-

ons, *hidden in the darke, and not brought to light*, if he intend *comparatively*, in respect of the cleare revelation made of the mind, and will of God by Jesus Christ, we grant it: if he meane it *absolutely*, that there were no promises of life & immortallity given under the Law, it is absolutely false. For

§. 59. 1. There are *innumerable* promises of *Life* and immortallity in the Old Testament, given to the Church under the Law. See Heb. 11. 4. Deu. 12. 1. Deut. 30. 6. Psal. 19. 10, 11. Deut. 33. 29. Psal. 130. 8. Isa. 25. 8, 9. Chap. 45. 17. Chap. 15. 6, 7. Jerem. 23. 6. Psal. 2. 12. Psal. 32. 1, 2. Psal. 33. 12.

§. 60. 2. They *Believed* Eternall life, & therefore they had the *promise* of it, for Faith relieth alwayes on the word of promise; Thus did *Job*, Chap. 19. 25, 26, 27. and *David*, Psal. 17. 15. So did *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, Heb. 11. 10, 11, 12. Yea and some of them as a patterne and Example, without *dying* obtained it, as *Enoch* and *Elias*.

3. The Covenant of *Abraham* was that, which they lived in, and under; But this Covenant of *Abraham* had promises of *Eternall Life*: Even that *God would be his God, dead and alive*, Gen. 17. 1, 7. And that the promises thereof were promises of *Eternall Life*, *Paul* manifests Rom. 4. 3. Gal. 3. 14. but this hath been so abundantly manifested by others, that I shall not longer insist upon it: we are come to the last querie of this Chapter. which is,

Though the Promises of the Gospell be better then those of the Law, yet are they not as well as those of the Law, proposed under conditions of Faith, and perseverance therein, of Holinesse, and Obedience, of repentance, and suffering for Christ; how speake the Scriptures? Iohn 3. 14, 15, 16, 18, 26. Hab. 2. 14. Heb. 2. 6. 2 Tim. 2. 11. Rom. 8. 13. Acts 3. 19. Rev. 2. 5, 16. Ioh. 5. 17.

§. 61. Neither will this Querie long detaine us: In the New Testament there being meanes designed for the attainement of an *End*, Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance, for the attainment of Salvation, and enjoyment of God through Christ; The Promises of it are of two sorts: Some respect the *End*, or our whole acceptation with God; Some the *meanes*, or way whereby we come to be accepted in Christ. The first sort are those insisted on by M.B. and they are so farre *Conditionall*, as that they declare the firme connexion and concatenation of

the

the *end* and meanes proposed: So that without them it is not to be attained; but the other of working Faith, and new Obedience, and Perseverance, are all Absolute to the Children of the Covenant, as I have so fully and largely elsewhere declared, that I shall not here repeat any thing there written nor doe I know any necessity of adding any thing thereunto. I thought to have proceeded with the Racovian Catechisme also, as in the former part of the Discourse: But having made this processe; I had notice of an answer to the whole by *Arnoldus* the Professor of Divinity at *Franeker*, and therefore that I may not *alium agere*, nor seeme to enter an others labour, I shall not directly, and κατ' ανθρ, carry on a confutation thereof hereafter, but only divert thereunto, as I shall have occasion, yet not omitting any thing of weight therein, as in this Chapter I have not, as to the matter under Consideration. Persever. of Saints.

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Kingly Office of Jesus Christ, and of the Worship that is ascribed, and due to him.

OF the Nature of the *Kingly Office* of Jesus Christ, his *Investiture* with it, his *Administration* of it, with the efficacy of that Power which therein he puts forth, both towards his *Elect*, and *others*, M.B. doth not administer any occasion to discourse. It is acknowledged by him, that he *was*, (or at least *is*) a *King*, by the designation and Appointment of the Father, to whom, as he was *Mediator*, he was subject: that he abides in his Rule and Dominion as such, and shall do so to the end of the World, and I shall not make any farther enquiry, as to these things, unlesse farther occasion be administred. Upon the account of this *Authority*, they say, he is *God*. Now whereas it is certain, that this Authority of his shall *cease at the end of the World*, 1 *Cor.* 15.28. it seems, that he shall then also cease to be God: such a *God* as they now allow him to be. §. 1.

By some passages in his *Second* and *Third* Questions, he seems §. 2.

to intimate, that Christ was not invested in his Kingdome be-
§. 2. fore his Ascension into Heaven. So Quest. the Second. *Is Christ already invested in his Kingdome, and did he after his ascension, and sitting at the right hand of God, exercise Dominion, and Soveraignty over men and Angells?* And Quest. third. *For what cause, and to what end was Jesus Christ exalted to his Kingdome?* To which he Answers from *Phil.* 2.8,9,10. In both places intimating, that Christ was not invested with *his Kingly power*, untill after his Exaltation. (As for the *ends* of his Exaltation, these being some mentioned, though not all, nor the chiefe, I shall not farther insist on them.) But that this, as it is contrary to the Testimony, that himselfe gave of his being a *King*, in a *Kingdome*, which was not *of this World*, it being a great part of that Office, whereunto he was of his Father anoynted; so it is altogether inconsistent with M. B's principles, who maintaines, that he was worshiped with *Religious* worship and Honour, whilest he was upon the Earth; which Honour and Worship (saies he) is due to him, and to be performed meerly upon the account of that Power and Authority, which is given him of God, as also say all his companions: and certainly his Power and Authority belong to him as King. The making of *him a King*, and the making of *him a God*, is with them all one. But that he was a God, whilest he was upon the Earth, they acknowledge from the words of *Thomas* to him, *my Lord and my God.*

§. 3. And the Title of the twelfth chapter of *Smalcius* his Book, *De vera Jesu Christi Divinitate*, is, *De nomine Dei, quod Jesus Christus in terris mortalis degens habuit*[a]. Which in the Chapter it selfe he seeks to make good by sundry instances: and in the issue labours to prove, that the sole cause of the Attribution of that name to him, *is from his Office*; but what *Office* indeed he expresseth not. The name of God they say is a name of *Office* and *Authority*: The Authority of Christ on which account he is to be *worshipped*, is, that which he hath as *King*. And yet the same *Author* [b] afterward contends, that *Christ was not a King untill after his Resurrection and Ascension*. For my part I am not solicitous

a Divinitas autem Iesu Christi qualis sit, discimus ex sacris literis, nempe talis, quæ propter munus ipsius divinum tota ei tribuitur. Smal. de Divin. Ies. Ch. Cap. 12.

b *Nec enim prius D. Iesus Rex reipsa factus est, quam cum consedit ad dextram Dei Patris, & regnare reipsa in cælo, & in terra cepit.* idem cap. 13. Sec. 3. c *Dominus & Deus proculdubio a Thoma appellatur, quia sit talis Dominus, qui divino modo in homines imperium habeat, & divino etiam illud modo exercere possit, & exerceat.* idem cap. 24. de fid. in Christum. &c.

about

about reconciling him to himselfe; let them that are so, take paines if they please therein. Some paines I conceive it may cost them; considering, that ihe afterwards affirmes expressly, that he was called Lord and God of *Thomas*, because of his Divine Rule, or Kingdome; which, as I remember, was before his Ascension.

As for his Exaltation at his Ascension, it was not by any investiture in any new Office, but by an Admission to the Execution of that part of his work of Mediatorship which did remaine, in a full and glorious manner; the whole concernment of his humiliation being past; In the mean time doubtlesse he was a King, when the Lord of Glory was crucifyed. §. 4. 1. Cor. 2. 8.

But that which remaines of this Chap. is more fully to be considered. §. 5.

Question 4. is. *How ought men to Honour the Sonne of God?*

From hence to the end of the Chap. M. B. insists on the *Religious Worship*, and invocation of Jesus Christ: which with all his Companions, he places as the consequent of his *Kingly Office*, and that *Authority*, wherewith for the execution and discharge thereof from God he is invested. I shall very briefly consider what is tendered by M. B. to the purpose in hand, and then *take liberty* a little more largely to handle the whole businesse of the *Worship* of Jesus Christ, with the Grounds, Reasons, and Motives thereof.

His Fifth *Question* to this matter is, *How ought men to Honour the Sonne of God, Christ Jesus.* §. 6.

And it is Answered *Joh.* 5. 23. *Even as they honour the Father.*

This then is consented unto on both sides; that Jesus Christ is to be *Worshipped*, and *Honoured* with the *same Worship*, and *Honour* wherewith the Father is Worshipped and Honoured; that is, with that Worship and Honour, which is *Divine* and *Religious*, with that *subjection* of Soule, and in the performance of those duties, which are due to God alone. How *Socinus* himselfe doubled in this businesse, and was intangled, shall be afterwards discovered. What use will be made of this, in the issue of this discourse, the *Reader* may easily conjecture.

Οὐ κτιστὸς τοίνυν ὁ λόγος, ὅτι προσκυνητός. *Epiphan. in Anchorat.*

His next Question discovering the danger of the *non performance* of this duty, of yeilding *Divine Honour and Worship* to Christ, strengthens the former Assertion, and therefore I have §. 7.

nothing to except, or adde thereunto.

§. 8. In *Question* the Sixth M. B. labours to defend the *throat* of his Cause, against the edge of that Weapon, which is sharpned against it by this concession, That Jesus Christ is to be Worshiped with *Divine Worship, as the Father is*, by a diversion of it; with a consideration of the grounds of the Assignation of this *Worship* to Christ. His words are; *Ought men to Honour the Son, as they Honour the Father, because he hath the same Essence with the Father, or because he hath the same Judiciary power, what is the decision of the Son himself concerning this point?*

Ans. Joh. 5.22,23.

The summe is: The *same Worship* is to be given to the *Father* and the *Son*, but upon severall grounds; To the Father, because *He is God* by Nature, because of his Divine Essence: to the *Son*, because of a *Delegated Judiciary Power* committed to him by the Father. For the discovery of the vanity of this Assertion, in the close of our Consideration of this matter, I shall manifest.

§. 9. 1. That there neither *is*, nor *can* be, any more then one *formall* cause of the Attribution of the *same Divine Worship* to any; so that to whomsoever it is ascribed, it is upon *one* and the same individuall account, as to the *formall*, and fundamentall cause thereof.

§. 10. 2. That no *delegated Power of Judgement is*, or *can* be a sufficient ground, or cause of yielding that Worship and Honour to him, to whom it is delegated, which is *proper* to God. For the present, to the *Text* pleaded, (*the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgement unto the Son, that all men should honour the Son, as they honour the Father.*) I say in brief, that ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι, is not expressive of the *formall* cause of the honouring, and Adoration of Christ, but of an *effectuall motive* to men to honour *him*, to whom upon the account of his *divine Nature* that honour is due. As in the First Commandement, *I am the Lord thy God, that brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage, thou shalt have no other Gods but me.* That Expression, *That brought thee out of the Land of Egypt*, is a *motive* to the Worship of God, but not the *formall* cause of it: that being due to him, as he is by Nature God, blessed for ever, though he had never brought that *People* out of *Egypt*: but of this more afterwrd.

Quest.

Quest. 7. A farther diversion from the matter in hand is attempted by this inquiry. *Did the Father give judiciary power to the Son, because he had in him the Divine Nature, personally united to the Humane, or because he was the Son of* Man: *what is the decision of the Son himselfe concerning this point also?* §. 11.

A. *He hath given him authority to execute judgement, because he is the Son of Man,* Ioh. 5. 27.

1. A point in difference is *stated*, and its decision enquired after, wherein there is no such difference at all. Nor do we say, that God gave Christ the *judiciary Power*, wherewith as Mediatour he is invested, because he had in him *the Divine Nature personally united to his Humane.* The Power that Christ hath upon the account of his Divine Nature, is not *delegated*, but *essentiall* to him: nor can M. B. name any, that have so *stated* the difference as he here proposes it.

2. We say not that Christ *had in him the Divine Nature personally united to the Humane*; but that the *Humane Nature* was Personally united to the *Divine.* His *Personality* belonging to him upon the account of his *Divine nature*, not his *Humane.*

3. We grant, that the *judiciary power*, that was delegated to Christ, as Mediator, he being appointed of God to judge the World; was given him because *he is the Son of Man*, or was *made Man* to be our Mediator; and to accomplish the great work of the Salvation of Man-kind. But that Divine Worship, proper to God the Father, is due, and to be yielded, and ascribed to him on this ground and Reason, *because he is the Son of Man*, M. B. cannot prove, nor doth attempt it.

The 8, 9, 10. Quest. belong not to us: we grant it was, and is, the Will and Command of God, that Iesus Christ the Mediator should be *worshiped* of *Angells* and *Men*; and that he was so Worshiped even in this World; for when he *brought his first begotten into the World*, he said, *let all the Angels of God worship him*; and that he is also to be worshipped now, having finished his work, being *exalted on the Right hand of God*; but that the bottome, foundation, and sole *formall* cause of the Worship, which God so commands to be yeilded to him, is any thing but his being *God blessed for evermore*, or his being the only begotten Son of God, there is not in the places mentioned the least intimation. §. 12. Heb. 1. 6.

§. 13. The 11, 12. look againe the same way with the former, but with the same successe. Saith he, *When men ascribe Glory and Dominion to Jesus Christ in the Scripture, and withall intimate the ground thereof, is it because they conceive him to be very God, and to have been eternally begotten out of the Divine Essence, or because he gave himselfe to death: let me heare how they explaine themselves?*

Ans. Rev. 5. 6.

Q. 12. *Are the Angels of the same Opinion with the Saints, when they also ascribe Glory and Dominion to him, let me heare how they also explain themselves?*

Ans: Rev. 5. 11, 12. Of both these places afterward.

At present 1. Christ *as a Lamb*, is Christ as Mediator, both God and Man, to whom all Honour and Glory is due.

2. Neither *Saints*, nor *Angels*, do give, or intend to give the Reason why Christ is to be worshiped, or what is the *formall Reason* why Divine worship is ascribed to him, but only what is in their thoughts and considerations a powerfull and *effectuall motive* to Love, Feare, Worship, & to ascribe all glory to him: As *David* often cries, *praise the Lord O my Soule* (or assignes glory and Honour to him) because *he hath done such or such things*; intimating a *motive* to his Worship, and not the *prime* foundation and cause, why he is to be Worshiped.

§. 14. Having spoken thus to the Adoration of Christ, his last *Question* is about his *Invocation*, which he proves from sundry places of Scripture, not inquiring into the Reasons of it; so that adding that to the former Concession of the Worship and Honour due to him, I shall close these considerations with this one *Syllogisme. He who is to be Worshiped by Angels and Men with that Divine worship, which is due to God the Father, & to be prayed unto, called on, believed in, is God by nature, blessed for ever:* but according to the confession of Mr. B. Jesus Christ is to be *worshipped by Angells and Men with that Divine worship, which is due even to God the Father, and to be prayed unto: Therefore is he God by Nature over all, blessed for ever.* The inference of the *major* Proposition I shall farther confirme in the ensuing Considerations of the Worship, that is ascribed to Jesus Christ in the Scripture.

§. 15. In the endeavour of *Faustus Socinus* to set up a new Religion, there was not any thing wherein he was more opposed, or wherewith he was more exercised, by the men of the same de-

signe

signe with himselfe, then in this, about the *Worship* and *Invocation* of Iesus Christ. He and his Unkle *Lælius*, urging (amongst others) this Proposition, *that Christ was not God*, *Franciscus David*, *Budnæus*, *Christianus Franken*, *Paleologus*, with others, made the conclusion, that he was not to be worshiped as God, nor called upon. With some of these he had sundry Disputes and conferences, and was miserably intricated by them, being unable to defend his opinion, upon his *Hypothesis* of the Person of Christ. That Christ is to be *worshiped*, and *Invocated*, indeed he proves well and Learnedly, as in many places, so especially in his third Epistle to *Mathias Radecius*: But coming to *knit* his Arguments to his other opinion concerning Christ, he was perpetually gravelled, as more especially it befell him in his dispute with *Christianus Franken An.* 1584. as is evident in what is extant of that Dispute, written by *Socinus* himselfe. Of the chiefe argument insisted on by *Franken*, I shall speak afterwards: see *Disput. cum Franken*, p. 24, 25, 28, 35, &c. Against *Franciscus David*, he wrote a peculiar Tract; & to him an Epistle, to prove that the words of *Thomas*, *my Lord and my God*, were spoken of Christ, and therefore he was to be Worshiped; (*Epist.* pag. 186.) wherein [d] he positively affirmes, that there was no other reading of the words (as *David* vainly pretended) but what is in common use, because *Erasmus* made mention of no such thing, who would not have omitted it, could he have made any discovery thereof, being justly supposed to be no good friend to the *Trinity*. That men may know what to judge of some of his Annotations, as well as those of *Grotius*, who walkes in the same paths, is this remarked. Wherefore He and his Associates rejected this *Franciscus David*, afterward as a *detestable Heretick*, and utterly deserted him when he was cast into Prison by the Prince of *Transilvania*, where he dyed miserably raving and crying out, that the *Divels expected, and waited for his company in his journey, which he had to go.* (*Florim: Ræm. l.* 4. *c.* 12.) the account whereof *Smalcius* also gives us, in his relation

[d] *Primũ igitur quod attinet ad priorem rationem dico, diversam illam lectionem non extare, ut arbitror, neq; in ullo probato codice, neq; apud ullum probatum Scriptorem, quod vel ex eo constare potest, quod Erasmus in suis Annotationibus, quamvis de hoc ipso loco agat, eius rei nullam prorsus mentionem facit: Qui Erasmus, cum hoc in genere nusquam non diligentissime versatur; tum in omnibus locis, in quibus Christus Deus appellari videtur, adeo diligenter omnia verba expendit, atq; examinat, ut non immerito & Trinitariis Arianismi suspectus fuerit, & ab Antitrinitariis inter eos relatus, quæ subobscure Trinitati reclamaverint.* Faust. Socin. Epist. ad Fran. David. p. 186, 187.

* Exemplum deniq; affert nostrorum Thes. 108. of * Franzius, Theses de Hypocrit. disput. 9. p. 298. *Quomode se gesserint in Transilvania in negotio Franciſci Davidis, quomodo semetipsos in actu illo inter se reos agant vafriciæ, perfidiæ, crudelitatis, sanguinariæ proditionis, &c. sed his primùm regero: non exemplis, sed legibus judicandum esse: si nostri ita se gesserunt ut scribit Frantzius, &c. Deinde dico falso ista objecta fuisse ab autoribus scripti, quod citat Frantzius nostris: nec enim fraternè tractarunt Franciſcum Davidem, usq; ad ipsum agonem, quanquam eum ut fratrem tractare non tenebantur, qui in Jesu Christi veram divinitatem tam impie involabat, ut dicere non dubitaret, tantum peccatum esse eum invocare, quantum est, si virgo Maria invocetur, &c.* Smal. Refut. Thes. Franz. disp. 9. p. 298.

§. 16. After these stirs, and disputations, it grew the common *tenent* of *Socinus*, and his *followers* (see his Epistle to *Enjedinus*) that those who denyed that Christ was to be worshiped, and *invocated*, were not to be accounted *Christians*: (which how well it agrees with other of his assertions shall instantly be seen.) So *Socinus* himselfe leads the way: *Respondad* e *Nemojevium Ep.* 1. who is followed by *Volkelius*. f *Unlesse* (saith he) *we dare to call on the name of Christ we should not be worthy of the name of Christians.* And he is attended by the *Racovian Catechisme, de Præcept. Christi cap.* 1. whose Author affirmes plainely, *that he esteemed them not Christians who worshiped him not*; and g accounted that indeed they had not Christ, however in word they durst not deny him.

e *Recte igitur existimasti, mihi quoq; verisimile videri, eum, qui Dominum Jesum Christum invocare non vult, aut non audet, vix Christiani nomine dignum esse: nisi quod non modo vix, sed ne vix quidem, & non modo verisimile id mihi videtur, sed persuasissimum mihi est.* f *Eum invocare si non audeamus, Christiano nomine haud satis digni merito existimari possemus.* Volkel. de Vera Relig. lib. 4. cap. 11 de Christi invocatione p. 221. g *Quid vero sentis de iis hominibus qui Christum non invocant, nec invocandum censent? Prorsus non esse Christianos sentio: cum reipsa Christum non habeant, & licet verbis id negare non audeant, reipsa tamen negent.* Catec. Rac. de præcep. Christi, cap. 1. p. 126.

And of the rest, the same is the Judgement: but yet with what consistency with what they also affirme concerning this Invocation of Christ, we shall now briefely consider.

§. 17. h *Socinus* in his third Epistle to *Mathias Radecius*, whom he every where speakes honourably of, and calls him *excellent man, Friend, Brother*, and much to be *observed Lord* (because he was a great man) who yet denyed, and opposed this invocation of

h *Eruditione, virtute, pietate præstantissimo viro D. Matthæo Radecio, amico, & Domino mihi plurimum observando, &c. Præstantissime vir, amice, frater, ac domine plurimum observande.*

Christ

Christ, lays this down in the entrance of his Discourse, That there is nothing of greater moment in Christian *Religion*, then the demonstration of this, *that invocation, and Adoration, or divine worship, do agree to Christ, although he be a created thing.* And in the following words he gives you the Reason of the importance of the proof of this Assertion: namely, because the [k] *Trinitarians* maine strength and Argument lyes in this; that Adoration and Invocation are due to Christ, which are proper only to the high God. Which makes me bold on the other side to affirme, that there is nothing in Christian Religion, more cleare, nor more needfull to be confirmed, then this, that *divine worship neither is, can, nor ought by the will of God, to be ascribed to any who by nature is not God, to any that is a meere creature, of what dignity, power, and authority soever.* But yet now when this zealous Champion for the invocation of Christ comes to prove his Assertion, being utterly destitute of the use of that which is the sure bottome and foundation thereof, he dares goe no farther but only says that we MAY call upon Christ if we will, but for any *precept* making it *necessary* so to do, that he sayes there is none.

i *Video enim nihil hodie edi posse in tota Christiana Religione majoris momenti quam hoc sit, demonstratio, videlicet, quod Christo licet creaturæ tamen invocatio & adoratio seu cultus divinus conveniat.* Socin. Epist. ad Rad. 3. pag. 143.

k *Si enim hoc demonstratum fuerit, concident omnes Trinitariorum munitiones, quæ revera uno hoc fundamento nituntur adhuc, quod Christo Adoratio & Invocatio conveniunt, quæ solius Dei illius altissimi omni ratione videtur esse propria.* id. ibid.

And therefore he distinguisheth between the [l] *Adoration* of Christ, and his *Invocation.* For the first, he affirmes, that it is commanded, or at least that things are so ordered, that we ought to *adore* him, but of the *latter*, sayes he, there is no *precept*, only we may doe so if we will. The same he had before affirmed in his answer to [m] *Franciscus David.* Yea in the same discourse he affirmes, that if [n] *we have so much faith, as that we can go with confidence to God without him, we need not invocate Christ. We may* (saith he) *invocate Christ, but we are not bound so to do.* Whence

l *Hic primum adorationem invocationem confundis, quod tamen fieri non debet, cum utriusq; sit diversa quædam ratio, adeo ut ego, quamvis nihil prorsus dubitem, præceptum extare de adorando Christo, & etiamsi non extaret, tamen eum a nobis adorari omnino debere, non idem tamen existimem de eodem invocando, cum videlicet invocatio pro ipsa ejus imploratione, & directione precum nostrarum accipitur. Hic enim statuo id quidem merito a nobis fieri posse, id est, posse nos jure ad ipsum Christum preces nostras dirigere, nihil tamen esse quod nos id facere cogat.* Socin. Epist. ad Radec. 3. pag. 151.

m *Christum Dominum invocare possumus, sed non debemus, sive non tenemur.*

n *Quod si quis tanta est fide præditus, ut ad Deum ipsum perpetuo recte accedere audeat; huic non opus est, ut Christum invocet.* Disput. cum Fran. pag. 4.

Memoje-

o *Niemojevius* falls upon him, & tells him, that he had utterly spoil'd their cause by that *concession*. To deliver himself frõ which charge, how pittifully he intricates himselfe, may be seen in his answer to that Epistle. Now whether this man hath sufficient cause to exclude any from being Christians, for the non-performance of that, which himselfe dares not affirme that they ought to do, and with what consistency of principles these things are affirmed, is easy to Judge.

o *Legi quoq; diligenter responsionem tuam ad argumenta Francisci Davidis; ubi Christi domini invocationem honoremq; nomini ejus sacrosancto convenientem asseris, ac contra calumnias Francisci Davidis defendis. Attamen videris mihi, paucis verbis, optimam sententiam non tantum obscurasse, sed quasi in dubium revocasse, adversariosq; in errore confirmasse. Quæris quid sit, quod tantum malum secum importare possit? Breviter respondeo, verba illa quæ sæpius addis; Christum Dominum invocare possumus, sed non debemus, sive non tenemur, &c. ruinam negotio, causæq; tuæ minantur: Non possum percipere, quomodo hæc conciliari possint: non debemus, sed possumus. quasi in negotio salutis nostræ liberum sit facere vel omittere; prout nobis aliquid magis necessarium, vel e contra visum fuerit:* Niemojevius Epist. 1. ad Faust. Socin. An. 1587.

§. 18. Of the same judgement with him is *Volk. de vera Rel. l. 4. c. 11. de Christi invocatione. Schlincting. ad: Meisner. pag.* 206, 207. and generally the rest of them. Which againe how consistent it is, with what they affirme in the p *Racovian Catechisme*, namely, that this is an *addition which Jesus Christ hath made to the first Commandement, that he himselfe is to be acknowledged a God, to whom we are bound to yeild divine Honour, I see not.* For if this be added to the first Commandement, that we should worship him as God, it is scarce doubtlesse at our *liberty* to call upon him or no. Of the same minde is *Smalcius de Divinitate Jesu Christi:* A q Book that he offered to *Sigismund* the third King of *Poland*, by the meanes of *Jacobus Sienienska* Palatine of *Podolia* inthe yeare 1608. who in his Epistle to the King calls him his *Pastor*. And yet the same r Person doth in another place of the the same

p *Quid præterea huic præcepto primo dominus Jesus addidit, id, quod etiam dominum Jesum pro Deo agnoscere tenemur: id est, pro eo qui in nos potestatem habet divinam & cui nos divinum exhibere honorem obstricti sumus.* Catec. Racov. de præcep. Christi cap. 1.

q *Cum itaq; nuper, libellus de Christi divinitate conscriptus, esset mihi a Pastore meo, viro cum primis pio & literato, oblatus, in quo--- disseruit.* Epist dedic. ad Sigismund

r *Videtur autem hoc inprimis modo diabolus insidias struere domino Iesu, dum scilicet tales excitat, qui non dubitant affirmare Dominum Iesum nunc plane esse otiosum in cælis, & res humanas vel salutem hominum non aliter curare, quam Moses curat salutem Iudæorum. Qui quidem homines, professione videri volunt Christiani, interne vero Christum abnegarunt, & spiritu judaico, qui semper Christo fuit inimicissimus, inflati sunt; & si quis jure cum eis agere velit, indigni plane sunt, qui inter Christianos numerentur, quantumvis ore tenus Christum profiteantur, & multa de eo garriant; adeo ut multo tolerabilior sit error illorum qui Christum pro illo uno Deo habent & colunt, quam istorum: & præstet ex duobus malis minus quod aiunt, eligendo, Trinitarium quam hujusmodi blasphemum esse.* Smal. de ver. Christi divin. cap. 15. de Regn. Christi Moderno.

Treatise, most bitterly inveigh against them who will not worship, nor invocate Christ, affirming, that they are worse then the *Trinitarians* themselves, then which it seemes he could invent nothing more vile to compare them with. [f] And yet againe that there is no *precept*, that he should be *invocated*. *Cat. Rac.* (That is the same person with the former) c. 5. *de præcep: Christi quæ legem prefecerunt.* So also *Ostorodus*, *Compendiolum Doctrinæ Ecclesiæ Christianæ nunc in Polonia potissimum florentis.* Cap. 1. Sect. 2.

[f] *Est enim invocatio Iesu Christi, ex numero earum rerum, quas præcipere nullo modo opus est.* idem. cap. 24. de fide in Christum. & de Adorat: & Invocat. Christi.

It is then on all hands concluded, that Jesus Christ is to be worshiped with Divine and Religious worship, due to God only. §. 19.

Fixing this as a common and *indisputable principle*, I shall subjoyne and prove these two Assertions.

1. In generall, divine worship is not to be ascribed to any, that is not *God by nature*, who is not partaker of the divine Essence and Being.

2. In particular, Jesus Christ is not to be [t] worshiped on the account of the Power and Authority, which he hath received from God, as Mediatour, but solely on the account of his being *God blessed for ever*: And this is all that is required in answer to this *Tenth Chapter* of M. B. what followes on the Heads mentioned, is for the further satisfaction of the Reader in these things upon the occasion administred, and for his Assistance to the obviating of some other *Socinian Sophismes*, that he may meet withall. I shall be briefe in them both.

[t] Νήπιοι, ὅστις ἄνακτα θεῶν λόγον αἰὲν ἔοντα
Οὐ σέβει· ἰσοθέως παιδὸς ἐπευφανίης.
Νήπιοι, ὅστις ἄνακτα λόγον βέβιον ἔνθα φανέντα
Οὐ σέβει· ἰσοθέοιο λόγου. *Gregor. Theol.*

For the first: *Divine Worship* is not to be ascribed to them whom *God will certainely destroy*. He will not have us to *Worship* them, whom himselfe *hateth*. But now, all Gods that have not made the Heavens and the earth, he will destroy from under these Heavens. *Jer.* 10. 10, 11. Thus shall ye say unto §. 20.

them, the Gods that have not made the Heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the Earth, & from under these Heavens. It is a thing that God would have the *Nations* take notice of; and therefore is it written in the *Caldee Dialect* in the *Originall*, that they who were principally concerned in those dayes, might take the more notice of it. And it is an instruction that God put into the mouths of the meanest of his people, that they should *say it to them*; say ye to them. And the Assertion is *universall*, to all whatever, that have not *made the Heavens* and Earth, and so is applicable to the *Socinians* Christ; A *God* they say he is, as *Elijah* said of *Baal*, 1 Kings 18. 27. He is *made* o; but that he *made the Heavens and Earth*, they deny; and therefore he is so farre from having any right to be *worshiped*, that God hath threatned he shall be *destroyed*.

§. 21. Εδουλεύσατε τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὖσι θεοῖς.

Againe, the Apostle reckons it among the sinnes of the *Gentiles*, that *they worshiped them who by nature were not Gods*, Gal. 4.8. from which we are delivered by the *knowledge of God* in the Gospell. And the weight of the Apostles Assertion of the sinne of Gentiles, lyes in this, that by *nature they were not God*, who were worshiped. So that this is a thing indispensable, that *divine Worship* should not be given to any who is not *God by nature*; And surely we are not called in the Gospell to the practice of that, which is the *greatest sinne of the Heathens*, that knew not God. And to manifest that this is a thing which the Law of nature gives direction in, not depending on institution; *Rom.* 1. it is reckoned among those sinnes, which are against the *Light of nature*; they worshiped the *Creature* (*besides or*) *more then* (*or with*) *the Creatour*, v. 25. who is God blessed for ever more. To worship a *Creature*, him who is not the Creator, God blessed for ever, is that *Idolatry*, which is condemned in the Gentiles, as a sinne against the Light of nature, which to commit, God cannot, (be it spoken with reverence) dispense with the Sons of men (for he cannot deny himselfe) much lesse institute and appoint them so to doe. It being then on all hands confessed, that Christ is to be worshiped with *divine or Religious worship*, it will be easy to make the conclusion, that he is God by *nature*, blessed for ever more.

Ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα.

Vid Diatrib. de Just. div.

§. 22. That also is generall and indispensable which you have *Jerem.* 17. 5, 6. *Cursed be the man, that trusteth in man, and maketh*

maketh flesh his arme, and whose heart departeth from the Lord; for he shall be like the Heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh. That which we worship with *divine worship*, we *trust in*, and make it our *arme* and *strength*; And those words, *and whose heart departeth from the Lord*, are not so much an addition to what is before cursed, as a declaration of it. All Trust in man, who is no more but so, with that kinde of Trust, wherewith we trust in *Jehovah* (as by the *antithesis v.7.* is evident that it is intended,) is here cursed. If Christ be only a man by nature, however exalted and invested with Authority, yet to trust in him, as we trust in *Jehovah*, which we doe if we worship him with divine worship, would by this Rule be denounced a Cursed thing.

Revel. 19. 20. and Chap. 22. 9. do adde the command of God to the generall Reason insisted on in the places before mentioned; *I fell at his feet to worship him; and he said, see thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and thy bretheren, that have the Testimony of Jesus, worship God*; so againe, Chap. 22. 9. There are evidently two Reasons assigned by the *Angell*, why *John* ought not to worship him. 1. Because he was a *servant*. He that is a *servant* of God, and is no more, is not to be worshiped; Now he that is not God, at his best estate, however exalted, is but a *servant* in respect of God, and a *fellow servant* of his Saints and no more. All his Creatures serve him, and for his will they were made. Such and no other is the *Socinians Christ*, and is clearely deprived of all worship by this prohibition, and Reason of it. 2. From the *Command*, and the *naturall*, and Eternall Obligation of it, in those repeated words * τῷ Θεῷ προσκύνησον. It is the *word* of the Law, that our Saviour himselfe insists on, Mat. 4. 10. that is here repeated; and the force of the Angells Reason, for the strengthning *his* prohibition, is from hence, that *no other* but he who is God, that God intended by the Law, and by our Saviour, *Math.* 4. is to be worshipped. For if the intendment of the words were only *Positive*, that God is to be worshipped, and did not also at the same time exclude every one whatever from all *divine worship*, who is not that God, they would be of no force for the reproofe of *John*, in his attempt to worship the *Angel* nor have any influence into his prohibition. And thus that *Angel*, who C. 5. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 shewes *John* all Creatures in

§. 23.

Revel. 4. 11.

* Ἐδίδασκε ὡς ἢ καὶ τὸν θεὸν μόνον δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, εἰπὼν μεγίστη ἐντολὴ ἐστι, κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις. *Iustin. Mar. Apol.*

Heaven and Earth, *yeilding divine worship*, and Adoration to the *Lamb*, the Lord Jesus Christ; in the close of all appropriates all that worship to God himselfe alone, and for ever shuts out the most glorious Creature from our thoughts and intentions in the performance of any divine worship, or religious Adoration.

§. 24. And it may hence appeare, how vaine is that plea of the Adversaries to avoid the force of this reproofe, which is managed by *Schlichtingius* against *Meisnerus*. "To those places "(saith he) where mention is made of God *alone* to be worshiped; I answer that by those exclusive particles alone, and "the like, when they are used of God, they are not simply "excluded, who depend on God in that thing which is treated "of; so is he said to be only wise, only powerfull, only immortall, and yet these who are made partakers of them from "God, ought not simply to be excluded from Wisdome, "Power, and Immortality: wherefore when it is said, that God "alone is to be worshiped and adored, he ought not to be simply excluded, who herein dependeth on God, because of that "divine rule over all, which he hath of him received, yea "he is rather included. So the most Learned of that Tribe. But

Respondeo particulis istis exclusivis, qualis & solus, & similis, cum de deo usurpantur, nunquã eos simpliciter excludi, qui a deo, in ea re de qua agitur, dependent: sic dicitur solus deus sapiens, solus potens, solus immortalos, neq; tamen simpliciter a sapientia, a potentia, immortalitate excludi debent & alii, qui istarum rerum participes sunt effecti: Quare jam cum solus deus adorandus aut invocandus esse dicitur, excludi simpliciter non debet is, qui hac in parte a deo pendet, propter divinum ab ipso in cuncta acceptum imperium, sed potius tacite simul includendus est. Schlicting. ad Meis. Artic. de deo. p. 206, 207.

§. 25. 1. By this Rule *nothing* is appropriated unto God, nor *any thing* excluded from a participation with him by that *particle* mentioned; and wherever *any thing is said* of God *only*, we are to understand it of *God and others*, for of him, in all things, doe all other things depend.

§. 26. 2. When it is said, that *God only is wise &c.* though it doe not absolutely deny that any other may be *wise* with that *Wisdome* which is proper to them, yet it absolutely denyes that any one partakes with God in his *Wisdome*; is *wise* as *God is wise*, with that kind of Wisdome wherewith God is wise. And so where it is said, that God only is to be worshiped, and honoured; though it do not exclude all others from any *kind of Worship* and

and Honour, but that they may have that which is due to them by Gods appointment, from their Excellency and prehemiinence, yet it doth *Absolutely* exclude any from being worshiped with *divine worship*, that is due and proper to God.

3. We shall shew afterward, that whatever Dignity, Rule, and Dominion, they say is given to Christ, and whatever excellency in him doth thence arise, yet it is quite of another kinde and stands upon another foote of account, then that Essentiall Excellency that is in God; and so cannot, nor doth require the same kind of worship as is due to God. §. 27.

4. Angels and men are *depending* on God in Authority and Power, and therefore if this Rule be true, they are not excluded from *Divine and Religious* Worship, in the Command of *worshiping God only*; and so they may be worshiped with divine and religious Adoration and Invocation, as well as Jesus Christ. Neither is it any thing but a meere *begging of the thing in question*, to say, that it is divine power that is delegated to Christ, which that is not, that is delegated to Angels and men. That power which is properly *divine*, and the *formall* cause of *divine worship* is *incommunicable*; nor can be delegated, nor is in any who is not essentially God: So that the power of Christ and Angels being of the same kind, though his be more and greater then theirs, as to degrees, they are to be worshiped with the same kind of worship, though he may be worshiped *more* then they. §. 28.

5. This is the substance of *Schlichtingius* his Rule; when any thing is affirmed of God *exclusively* to *others*, indeed *others* are not excluded, but included. §. 29.

6. We argue not *only* from the *exclusive particle*, but from the nature of the thing it selfe. So that this pretended Rule and Exception, notwithstanding, all, and every thing whatever that is not God, is by God himselfe everlastingly excluded from the *least share* in divine or Religious Worship, with expresse condemnation of them, who assigne it to them. §. 30.

The same evasion with that insisted on by *Schlichtingius*, *Socinus* himselfe had before used: and professes that this is the bottome & foundation of all his Arguments in his disputation with *Franciscus David*, about the invocation of Christ, that *others* as well as God may be worshiped and invocated: in his 3. *Epist.* to *Volkelius*, where he labours to answer the objection §. 31.

of *Johns* praying for Grace from the *seven spirits that are before the throne of Christ, Revel.* 1. "But why I pray is it absurd to affirme, that those seven spirits (supposing them meere creatures) were invocated of *John*? Is it because God alone is to be invocated? But that this Reason is of no value, that whole disputation doth demonstrate, not only because it is no where forbidden that we should invocate none but God, (*os durum*) but also, and much rather, because those interdictions never exclude those who are subordinate to God himselfe. That is, as was observed before, they exclude none at all; for all Creatures whatever are subordinate to God. To say that they are *subordinate* as to this end, that under him they may be *worshiped*, is purely to *begge the Question.* We deny that any is, or may be in such a subordination to God. And the Reasons the man adds of this his Assertion, containe the grand plea of all *Idolators, Heathenish*, and *Antichristian.* x *whatever is given to them* (saith he) *who are in that subordination is given to God.* So said the *Pagans* of old; so the *Papists* at this day, all redounds to the glory of God, when they worship stocks and stones, because he appoints them so to do. And so said the *Israelites* when they worshiped the *Golden Calfe*: it is a *feast to Jehovah.* But if *John* might worship, and *invocate* (which is the higheft Act of *Worship*) the *seven Spirits*, Rev. 1. because of their subordination to God, supposing them to be so many Created Spirits, why might he not as well worship the *Spirit*, or *Angel* in the end of the Booke, Chap. 20. 22. who was no lesse subordinate to God? was the matter so altered during his *Visions*, that whom he might *invocate* in the entrance, he might not so much as worship in the close?

* *Sed cur quæso absurdum est affirmare septem illos spiritus a Johanne fuisse invocatos? An quia solus Deus est invocandus? At qui hanc rationem nihili esse tota illa disputatione demonstratur. Non modo quia nunquam deserte interdictum est, quemquam alium præter deum ipsum invocare, sed etiam, & multo magis, quia ejusmodi interdictiones (ut sic loquar) nunquam eos excludunt, qui ipsi deo sunt subordinati.* Socin. Epist. ad Volk. 3.

x *Quicquid enim ab eo qui subordinationem istam recte novit & mente sua illam probat, in istos confertur, in deum ipsum confertur.*

§. 32. The *Racovian Catechisme* takes another course, and tells you, that the foundation of the Worship and Adoration of Christ, is, because * *Christ had added to the first Commandement, that we should*

* *Quid præterea dominus Jesus huic præcepto primo addidit?* Resp. *Id quod etiam unum dominum Jesum pro deo cognoscere tenemur, id est pro eo qui in nos potestatem habet divinam, & cui nos divinum exhibere honorem obstricti sumus.* Catech. Racov. de præcep. Christi.

acknowledge

acknowledge him for God. That is; he who hath *divine Authority* over *us*, to whom we are bound to yeeld Divine Honour. But

1. That Iesus Christ, who is *not God by Nature*, did *adde* to the command of God, that he himselfe should be acknowledged *for God*, is *intolerable Blasphemy*; asserted without the least colour or pretence from the Scripture, and opens a doore to downeright *Atheisme*. §. 33.

2. The Exposition of his *being God*, that is, *one who hath Divine Authority* over us, is false: God is a Name of *Nature*, not of *Office* and power, *Gal.* 4. 8. 3. Christ was *worshiped* and commanded to be *worshiped*, before his coming in the *flesh*, *Ps.* 2. 12. *Gen.* 48. 16. *Exod.* 23. 21. §. 34.

But if this be added to the First Commandement, that Christ be Worshiped as God: Then is he to be worshiped with the worship required in the *first* Commandement: Now this Worship is that which is proper to the *only* true God, as the very words of it import: *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me*: how then will *Smalcius* reconcile himselfe with his *Master*, who plainly affirmes, that Iesus Christ is not to be worshiped with that *divine worship*, which is due to God alone; and strives to answer that place of *John* 5. 23. to the contrary,[a] *that all men should honour the Son, as they honour the Father.* That Christ should be commanded to be worshiped in the First Commandement. (or by an addition made thereto) which commands us to have only one God, and not be worshiped with the worship which is due to that one God, is one of the *mysteries* of these mens Religion: but to proceed. §. 35.

[a] *Nos Paulo ante ostendimus divinum cultum, qui Christo debetur, & directe ipsum Christum respicit, non esse illum qui uni illi soli deo convenit.* Socin. ad Wieck. respon. ad cap. 10. Class. 5. Arg. 6. pag. 422, 423.

Where the *formali cause* of Divine Worship is not, there Divine Worship ought not to be exhibited. But in no Creature there is, or can be the *formal cause* of Divine Worship; therefore no creature, who is only such, can be worshiped without Idolatry. The *formal Reason* of any thing is but one; the reason of all worship is *Excellency or Preheminence*; The reason of *Divine* or Religious worship is divine *preheminence* and excellency. Now divine Excellency and preheminence is peculiar unto the Divine Nature. Wherein is it that God is so infinitely excellent above all creatures? Is it not from his infinitely good, and incom- §. 36.

comprehensible nature? Now look what difference there is between the *Essence* of the *Creator* and the *Creature*, the same is between their Excellency. Let a Creature be exalted to never so great an height of Dignity and Excellency; yet his dignity is not at all *nigher* to the dignity and excellency of God; because there is no *proportion* between that which is *infinite*, and that which is *finite*, and limited. If then Excellency and preheminence be the cause of worship, and the distance between the *excellency* of God, and that of the most excellent, and most highly advanced creature, be infinite, it is impossible that the respect and worship due to them, should be of the same kind. Now it is *Religious*, or Divine Adoration that is due to God, whereof the Excellency of his nature is the *formall* cause; this then cannot be ascribed to any other. And to whomsoever it is ascribed, thereby do we acknowledge to be in him all divine perfections; which if he be not God by Nature, is grosse Idolatry. In summe, *Adorability* (if I may so say) is an absolute incommunicable property of God. *Adoration* thence arising, a respect that relates to him only.

§. 37. I shall for a close of this Chapter proceed to manifest, that Christ himselfe is not by us *worshiped*, under any other *formall Reason*, but as he is God; which will adde some light to what hath already been spoken. And here least there should be any *mistake* among the *meanest*, in a matter of so great consequence, I shall deliver my thoughts to the whole of the worship of Christ in the ensuing observations.

§. 38. 1. Iesus Christ, the Mediatour, Θεάνθρωπος, God and Man, the Son of God, having *assumed* ἅγιον τὸ γενόμενον, (*Luk.* 1. 35.) that *holy thing*, *that was borne of the Virgin*, ἀνυπόστατον, having no subsistence of its own, into personall subsistence with himselfe, is to be *Worshipped* with divine Religious worship, even as the Father. By worshipped with Divine Worship, I meane *believed* in, *hoped* in, *trusted* in, invocated as God, as an independent fountaine of all good, and a soveraigne disposer of all our *present*, and *everlasting* concernments; by doing whereof, we acknowledge in him, and ascribe to him all divine perfections; Omnipotency, Omniscience, nfinite goodnesse, Omnipresence, and the like.

This proposition was sufficiently confirmed before. In the *Revelation*

Revelation you have the most solemne representation of the *divine spirituall worship* of the Church, both that *militant* in the *Earth*, and that *triumphant* in the *Heavens*, and by both is the Worship mentioned given to the Mediator; to him (to Iesus Christ) *that washed us in his blood, be glory and dominion for ever and ever, amen.* Cap. 1. 6. so againe the same Church represented by *fower living Creatures*, and 24 *Elders*, falls down before the Lamb. cap. 5. 8. and 12. *worthy is the Lamb that was slaine to receive power, and riches, and glory, and blessing:* and v. 13, 14. joynt worship is given to him upon the *Throne*, *and to the Lamb*, by the whole Creation. *And every Creature, which is in Heaven and in Earth, and under the Earth, and such as are in the Sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, Honour, Glory, and Power be unto him that sitteth on the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever, &c.* And this also is *particularly* done by the Church *triumphant*, cap. 7. 9, 10. Now the *Lamb* is neither Christ in respect of the Divine Nature, nor Christ in respect of the Humane Nature, but it is Christ the Mediator. That Christ was Mediator in respect of both Natures shall in due time be demonstrated. It is then the Person of the Mediator God and Man, who is the *Lamb of God*, that takes away the sinnes of the World, to whom all this Honour and Worship is ascribed. This the Apostle perfectly confirmes, *Rom.* 14. 8, 9, 10, 11. "For whether we live, "we live unto the Lord, and whether we dye, we dye unto the "Lord, whether we live therefore, or dye, we are the Lords: "for to this End Christ both dyed, and rose, and revived, that "he might be Lord both of the dead and the living: but why "doest thou judge thy Brother, or why doest thou set at "naught thy Brother: we shall all stand before the judge-"ment seat of Christ; For it is written, as I live saith the Lord, "every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confesse "to God. To Christ exalted in his dominion and Sove-raignty, we *live*, and *dye*: to him do we *bow* the knee, and *confesse*, that is, performe all Worthip, and stand before him, as at his dispose all; we *sweare* by him, as in the place from whence these words are taken.

2. That our * *Religious, Divine, and Spirituall worship*, hath a

* *Unum Deum, & unum ejus filium, & verbum, imaginemq;, quantum possumus supplicationibus, & honoribus veneremur, offerentes Deo universorum domino preces per suum unigenitum: cui prius eas adhibemus rogantes ut ipse, qui est propitiator pro peccatis nostris, dignetur tanquam pontifex preces nostras, & sacrificia & intercessiones, offerre Deo.* Origen. ad Celsum lib. 8.

double, or twofold respect unto Jesus Christ.

1. As he is the *ultimate formall* object of our worship, being God to be blessed for evermore, as was before declared. 2. As the *way*, meanes, & cause of all the good we receive from God in our religious approach to him. In the first sence, we *call upon the name of Christ*, 1 *Cor.* 1.2. In the other, *we aske the Father in his name*, according to his command, *Joh:* 16.23. In the first, we respect him as *one with the Father*, as one who thinks it no robbery to be *equall with him*, *Phil.* 2.8. the *fellow of the Lord of Hosts*. In the other, as one that doth *intercede* yet with the Father, *Heb.* 7.25. praying him *yet* to send the Comforter to us, being *yet* in that regard *lesse* then the Father; and in which respect, as he is *our head*, so God is *his head*, as the Apostle tells us, 1 *Cor:* 11.3. *the Head of every man* (that is every believer) *is Christ, and the head of Christ is God*; In this sence, is he the *way* whereby we go to the Father. And through him we have an access to the Father, *Eph.* 2.18. διὰ χριστοῦ, πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. In our Worship with our Faith, Love, Hope, Trust, and prayers, we have an access to God. Thus in our approach to the Throne of Grace, wee look upon Christ as the *High Priest over the House of God*, *Heb.* 4. 14, 15, 16. by whom we have admission; who *offers* up our Prayers and supplications for us, *Revel.* 8. 3. In this state as he is the *head of Angells*, and his whole Church, so is he in subordination to the Father, and therefore he is said at the same time to receive *Revelations* from the Father, and to *send an Angell* as his servant, on his work and employment; *Rev.* 1. 1. And thus is he our *Advocate* with the Father, 1 *John* 2.1. In this respect then, seeing that in our access to God, even the Father, as the Father of *Him*, and *His*, with our Worship, Homage, Service, our Faith, Love, Hope, Confidence, and Supplications, *eying* Christ, as our *Mediatour*, Advocate, Intercessor, upon whose Account we are *accepted*, for whose *sake* we are *pardoned*, through whom we have Admission to God, and by whom we have Help and Assistance in all that we have to do with God: It is evident (I say) that in this respect he is not *eyed*, nor addressed to in our Worship, as the *ultimate*, *adæquate*, *formall* object of it: But as the meritorious cause of our Approach and acceptance, and so of great consideration therein. And therefore whereas *Rom.* 3.25. it is said, that *God hath set him forth to be a propitiation through Faith*

Joh. 14.6.

John 20. 17.

in

in his blood: it is not intended, that Faith fixes on his blood, or blood-shedding, or on him as shedding his blood, as the *prime object* of it, but as the meritorious cause of our forgiveness of sinne, through the Righteousnesse of God. §. 41.

And these two distinct respects have we to Jesus Christ our Mediator, who is θεάνθρωπος, God and Man, in our Religious Worship, and all Acts of Communion with him: * As *one* with the Father we Honour him, Believe in him, Worship him, as we do the Father: As *Mediatour* depending on the Father, in subordination to him, so our Faith regards him, we *Love* him, and *Hope* in him, as the *Way*, *Meanes*, and Meritorious cause of our Acceptance with the Father. And in both these respects we have distinct communion with him. Μιᾷ προσκυνήσει, καὶ μίαν αὐτῷ τὴν δοξολογίαν ἀναπέμπων. *Synod. Ephes. Anath. 8. Cyrill.*

3. That Jesus Christ our Mediatour, θεάνθρωπος, God and Man, who is to be worshiped with Divine or Religious worship, is to be so worshped, because he is our Mediatour. That is, his *mediation* is the *ratio quia*, an unconquerable Reason, and Argument, why we ought to love him, feare him, believe in him, call upon him, and worship him in generall. This is the *Reason* still urged by the Holy Ghost, why we ought to worship him, *Revel.* 1.5,6. *To him that loved us, and washed us from our sinnes in his own blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests unto God, and his Father, to him be Glory, and Dominion for ever and ever.* Who would not *love him*, who would not *ascribe Honour* to him, who hath *so loved* us, and washed us in his own blood? So *Revel.* 5. 12. there is an Acknowledgement of the *power*, *riches*, *goodnesse*, *wisdome*, *strength*, *glory*, *and blessing*, that belongs to him, because, as the Lamb, as Mediatour, he hath done so great things for us. And I dare say, there is none of his *redeemed ones*, who finds not the power of this motive upon his heart. The Love of Christ in his Mediation, the work he has gone through in it, and that which he continueth in, the benefits we receive thereby, and our everlasting misery without it, are all chains upon our souls, to bind us to the Lord Christ in Faith, Love, and Obedience. But yet this Mediation of Christ is not the *formall and fundamentall* cause of our worship, (as shall be shewed) but only a motive thereunto. It is not the *ratio formalis, & fundamentalis cultus*; but only the *ratio quia*, or an Argument thereunto: Thus God dealing with his people, and exhorting them of old §. 42. Ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμᾶς. 2 Cor. 5. 14.

to worship and obedience, he says, *I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the house of Bondage, thou*
Exod. 20. 2, 3 *shalt have no other Gods but mee.* He makes his benefit of bringing them out of the *land of Egypt*, the reason of that eternally indispensable morall Worship, which he requires in the First Commandement; Not that that was the *formall cause* of that worship, for God is to be worshiped as the *first Soveraigne Independant Good*, as the absolute Lord of all, and fountain of all Good, whether he gives any such benefits or no: But yet all his Mercies, all his Benefits, every thing he doth for us, in his Providence, in his Grace, as to the things of this life, or of another, are all Arguments and Motives to presse us to the perfor-
Psal. 103. 1, 2. mance of all that Worship and Service, which we owe unto him, as our God and Creator. *Praise the Lord O my soule, for all his Benefits*, saith *David*: So is it in the case of our Mediator. For the work of his Mediation we are eternally obliged to render all Glory, Honour, and Thanksgiving to him. But yet his Mediation is not the *formall cause* thereof, but only an invincible motive thereunto. Let this therefore be our fourth and last Observation.

§. 43. 4. Though Jesus Christ, who is our Mediator, God and Man, be to be worshiped with Divine worship, *as we honour the Father*, yet this is not *as* he is *Mediator*, but *as* he is *God* blessed for evermore. He is not to be worshiped under this *redoplication, as Mediator*, though he who *is Mediator* is to be worshiped, and he is to be worshiped *because* he is Mediator. That is, his *Mediatory* Office is not the *formall* cause and Reason of yeelding divine worship to him, nor under that consideration is that worship ultimatly terminated in him. The formall Reason of any thing strictly taken, is but one: and it is that, from the concession whereof, that thing or effect whereof it is the cause or Reason, without any other help doth arise, or result from it. Now the *formall cause* or Reason of all Divine Worship is the *Deity*, or *Divine Nature*: *That* being granted, *Divine worship* necessarily followes to be due: *That* being denyed, that worship also is, and is to be for ever denied. We may not worship them, who by nature are not God. If it could be supposed, that we might have had a Mediator, that should not have been God (which was impossible) *Religious worship* would not have been yeelded

yeelded to him. And if the Son of God had never been our Mediator, yet he was to be worshiped.

It is the * *Deity* of Christ then, which is the *fundamentall, formall cause* and Reason, and the proper object of our worship; for that being granted, though we had no other Reason, or argument for it, yet we ought to worship him: and that being *denyed*, all other Reasons and Motives whatever would not be a sufficient cause, or warrant for any such proceeding.

*Γινωσκέτωσαν ὅτι τὸ κύριον ἐν σαρκὶ προσκυνοῦντες, οὐ κτίσματι προσκυνοῦμεν ἀλλὰ τὸ κτίστην ἐνδυσάμεναν τὸ κτιστὸν σῶμα. *Athan. Epist. ad Adelph. Episc.*

It is true, Christ hath a *power given* him of his Father, above all Angels, principalities, and powers: called *all power* in Heaven and Earth: a *name above every name*, giving him an excellency, an ἀξία, as he is μεσίτης, ἱκέτης; as he is the *King* and head of his *Church*, which is to be acknowledged, owned, ascribed to him; and the consideration whereof, with his ability and willingnesse therein to succour, relieve, and save us to the uttermost, in a way of Mediation, is a powerfull, effectuall motive. (as was said before) to his worship. But yet this is an Excellency which is distinct from that, which is purely, and properly divine; and so cannot be the *formall reason* of religious worship. Excellency is the cause of honour: every *distinct* Excellency & eminence is the cause of honour: every distinct Excelleney & eminence, is the cause of *distinct honour* and worship. Now what excellency or dignity soever is communicated by a way of delegation, is distinct, and of another kind, from that which is originall, infinite, and communicating: and therefore cannot be the *formall cause* of the same honour and worship. §. 44. Math. 28. 18. Phil. 2. 7.

I shall briefely give the reasons of the Assertion insisted on, and so passe on to what remaines. §. 45.

The first is taken from the nature of divine, or religious worship. It is that whereby we ascribe the Honour, and Glory of all infinite perfections, to him, whom we so worship; To be the *first* Cause, the fountaine of all good, *independent, infinitely wise, powerfull, alsufficient, almighty, alseeing, omnipotent, eternall*, the only rewarder, as such we submit our selves to him religiously, in Faith, Love, Obedience, Adoration, and Invocation. But now we cannot ascribe these divine Excellencys, & perfections unto Christ, as *Mediatour*: for then his *Mediation* should be the reason why *he* is all this; which it is not: but it is from

his divine nature alone, that so he is; and therefore thence alone is it that he is so worshiped.

§. 46. 2. Christ under this *formall conception* (as they speake,) *as Mediatour*, is not God; but under this, as *partaker* of the nature of God. Christ as *mediatour* is an expression, as they speake, in the *concrete*, whose *forme* is its *abstract*. Now that is his *mediation* or *Mediatory Office*; and therefore if Christ under this *formall conception* of a Mediator be God, his Mediatory office, and God, must be the same: which is false and absurd. Therefore as such, or on that fundamentall account, he is not worshiped with divine worship.

§. 47. 3. Christ in respect of his mediation dependeth on God, and hath all his power committed to him from God, Math. 11. 27. *All things* (saith he) *are given me of my Father*. And Math. 28. 18. *All power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth*. Joh. 17. 2. *Thou hast given unto him power over all flesh*; and in innumerable other places is the same testifyed. God gives him as Mediatour his *Name*, that is, his Authority. Now God is worshiped because he is *independent*, he *is*, and there is none besides him. He is α and ω, the *first* and the *last*; And if the reason why we worship God with divine worship be, because he is ἀνυπάρκτος, and independent: certainely that wherein Christ is dependent, and in subordination to him, as receiving it from him, cannot be the *formall cause* of attributing divine worship to him.

§. 48. 4. Christ in respect of his *divine nature* is equall with God, that is, the Father: 2 *Phil.* 9, 10. but in respect of his *Mediation*, he is not equall to him, he is *lesse* then he: my Father (saith he) is greater then I. *John* 14. 28. now whatever is *lesse* then God, is not equall to him, is infinitely so; for between *God*, and that which is *not God*, there is no proportion neither in *Being*, nor Excellency. That Christ in respect of his Office is not equall to God is commonly received in that *axiome*, whereby the arguments thence taken against his Deity are answered; *inæqualitas Officii non tollit æqualitatem naturæ*. Now certainely, that which is infinitely unequall to God, cannot be the *formall cause* of that worship which we yeild to him, as God.

§. 49. 5. That which shall cease, and is not *absolutely Eternall*, cannot be the *formall cause* of our worship: for the *formall reason* of worship can no more cease, then God can cease to be God

God: for when that ceaseth, we cease to worship him; which whiles he is the Creator, and soveraigne Lord of his Creatures, cannot be. Now that the *Mediatory Office* of Christ shall cease the Holy Ghost affirmeth, 1 *Cor.* 15. 24. he then gives up his Kingdome to God; and there is the same Reason of the other parts of his Mediatory office It is true indeed, the Efficacy of his Office abideth to Eternity, whilest the *Redeemed ones* live with God, and praise him; but as to the administration of his Office, that ceaseth, when at the last day the whole worke of it shall be perfectly consummated, & he hath *saved to the uttermost* all that come to God by him.

The sum of all is, Jesus Christ, God & man, our Mediatour, who is to be *worshiped* in all things, & *invocated* as the Father, & whom we ought night and day to honour, praise, love, and adore, because of his mediation, and the office of it, which for our sakes he hath undertaken, is so to be *honoured and worshiped*, Not as Mediatour, exalted of God, and intrusted with all power and dignity from him, but as being *equall with him, God* to be blessed for ever; his divine nature being the *fundamentall formall reason* of that worship, and proper ultimate object of it. And to close up this digression, there is not any thing that more sharply and severely cuts the throat of the whole sophisticall plea of the *Socinians*, against the Deity of Christ, then this one observation. Themselves acknowedge, that Christ is to be worshiped with religious worship, and his name to be invocated, denying to account them Christians, whatever they are, who are otherwise minded, as *Franciscus David*, and those before mentioned were. Now if there be no possible reason to be assigned for the *Formall cause* of this worship, but his Deity, they must either acknowledge *him* to be *God*, or deny *themselves* to be *Christians*. §. 50.

Some directions (by the way) may be given from that which hath been spoken, as to *Guidance* of our Soules in the *worship* of God: Or in our addresses to the *Throne of Grace* by Jesus Christ. What God hath discovered of *himselfe* unto us, he would have us act faith upon, in all that we have to deale with him in. By this we are assured we worship the true God, and not an *Idol*, when we worship *him*, *who* has revealed himselfe in his word, and *as* he has revealed himselfe. Now God hath declared §. 51.

red

red himselfe to be *three in one*, for, *there are three that beare witnesse in Heaven, & these three are one*, 1 Joh. 5. So then is he to be worshiped; And not only so, but the *Order* of the three Persons in that Deity, the eternall internall order among themselves is revealed to us. The Father is of none; is ἀυτάυτ☉. The Sonne *begotten of the Father*: having the glory of the *only begotten Sonne of God*, and so is ἀυτόθε☉, in respect of his *Nature, Essence*, and Being, not in respect of his *Personality*, which he hath of the *Father*. The *Spirit* is of the *Father* & the Son. He is often so called, the *Spirit of God*, & the *spirit of the Son*. For the Terme of *proceeding*, or going forth, I professe my selfe ignorant, whether it concerne *chiefely* his *eternall personality*, or his *dispensation* in the worke *of* the Gospell. The latter I rather like, of which this is no time to give my reasons. But be those expressions of what import soever, He is *equally* the Spirit of the Father and the Sonne: and is of them both, and *from* them both. God then, by us is to be worshiped, as he hath revealed the subsistence of the three Persons in this order, and so are we to deale with him in our approaches to him. Not that weare to frame any conception in our minds of distinct *substances*, which are not; but by Faith closing with this revelation of them, we give up our soules in contemplation and admiration of that we cannot comprehend.

§. 52. 2. There in an externall *œconomy* and dispensation of the persons, in reference to the work of our Salvation, & what we *draw nigh* to them for: so the Father is considered as the foundation of all *Mercy, Grace, Glory*, every thing that is *dispensed* in the *Covenant*, or revealed in the Gospell. The Son *receiving* all from him: and the Spirit sent by the *Son*, to effect and compleat the whole good pleasure of God in us, & toward us; & in, & under the consideration of this *œconomy*, is God of us to be worshiped.

§. 53. *All things* (saith Christ) *are given me of the Father* Math. 11.27. that is, to *me*, as Mediatour; therefore *come to me*: And in his prayer *Joh.* 17.8. *I have given to them the words thou gavest unto me, and they know that I came out from thee, and believe that thou hast sent me.* So most fully *Joh.* 3.34,35. He is *sent* of God, and from the love of the Father to him as Mediatour are all things given him, it *pleased the Father that in him all fullnes should dwell Joh* 1.16 *Col.* 23. *Joh.* 5. 26. *He hath given him to have life:* that is, as he is Mediator, appointed him to be the fountaine of *Spirituall life* to his elect and

and *Revel.* 1. 1. the *Revelation* of the will of God is *given* unto Christ by the *Father*, as to this end of discovering it to the Church.

Hence ariseth the second way of faiths acting it selfe toward God in our worship of him. It *eyes* the *Father* as the fountaine of this dispensation; and the *Sonne* as the *Mediatour*, as the storehouse, & the Spirit as immediate communicator thereof. Here also it considers the Sonne under those two distinct notions. 1. As the *Ordinance and servant of the Father*, in the great worke of Mediation: so it loves him, delights in him, and rejoyceth in the Wisedome of God, in finding out, and giving such a meanes of Life, Salvation, and union with himselfe; and so *by* Christ believes *in* God, even the Father. It considers him 2ly as the *way* of going to the Father, and there it rests, as the ultimate object of all the Religious actings of the soule. So we are very often said, *through*, and by *Christ*, to believe in God, *by him* to have an *accesse* to God, and an entrance to the throne of grace. In this sence, I say, when we *draw nigh* to God, in any religious worship yea in all the first actings, and movings of our soules towards him in faith, and love, the Lord Christ is considered as Mediator, as clothed with his offices, as doing the *will of the Father*, as serving the designe of his Love: and so the soule is immedialty fixed on God, through Christ, being strengthned, supported, and sustained by the consideration of Christ, as the only *procuring cause* of all the good things we seeke from God, and of our interest in those *excellencyes*, which are in him, which make him excellent to us. §. 54.

And this is the generall consideration that faith hath of Christ, in all our dealings with God; we *aske in his name*, for *his sake*, goe to God on *his* account, *through him*, and the like; are strengthned and imboldned upon the interest of him as our High Priest, and intercessor, God the Father being yet alwayes imediately in our eye, as the primary object of our worship. But yet now againe, this Christ, as Mediatour, so sent & intrusted by the Father, as above, is also *one* with the *Father*, God to be blessed for evermore. Faith also takes in this consideration, & so he who before was the *meanes of fixing* our faith on God, is thereupon become the proper object of our faith himselfe: *we believe in Him, invocate, call upon him, worship him*, put our trust in him, and §. 55.

live unto him: Over & above then the distinction that the *Eternall Persons* have in the manner of *in-being* in the same Essence, which also is the object of our Faith: that distinction which they have in the *Externall œconomy*, is to be considered in our Religious worship of God: and herein is Christ partly eyed as the Fathers *servant*, the meanes, and cause of all our communion with God, and so is the *medium* of our worship, not the *object*; partly as God and man vested with that office, and so he is the object *primary*, and *ultimate* of it also: And this may give us (I say) some *assistance* to order our thoughts aright towards God, and some light into that variety of expressions, which we have in Scripture, about worshiping of God in Christ: and worshiping of Christ also. So is it in respect of the Spirit.

§. 56. Having cleared the whole *matter* under consideration, it may be worth the while, a little to consider the condition of our *Adversaries*, in reference to this businesse, wherein of all other things (as I said before) they are most intangled. Of the contests and disputes of *Socinus* with *Franciscus David*, about this businesse, I have given the Reader an account formerly, and the little successe he had therein. The man would faine have *stood*, when he had kicked away the *ground* from under his feet, but was not able. And never was he more shamefully gravel'd in any dispute, then in that which he had with *Christianus Franken*, about this businesse, whereof I shall give the Reader a brief account.

§. 57. This *Franken* seems to have been a *subtile fellow*, who, denying with *Socinus* that Christ was God, saw evidently, that it was impossible to find out a foundation of yeelding Religious worship or Adoration unto him. With him, about this matter, *Socinus* had a solemne dispute in the house of one [a] *Paulicovius*, *An.* 1584. *March* 14. *Franken* in this Disputation was the *opponent*, and his first Argument is this. [b] "Look how great distance there is between the Creator and the Creature, so

a *Disputatio inter Faustum Socinum & Christianum Franken de honore Christi, id est, utrum Christus cum ipse perfectissima ratione deus non sit, religiosa tamen adoratione colendus sit, Habita*, 14. Martii. An. 1584. in aula Christophori Paulicovii.

b *Quanta distantia inter Creatorem est & creaturam, tanta esse debet differentia inter honorem qui creatori exhibetur, & qui creaturæ tribuitur: atqui inter creatorem & creaturam maxima est distantia; sive essentiam & naturam spectes, sive dignitatem & excellentiam: Ergo & maxima esse debet differentia inter honorem Dei & Creaturæ: at hunc qui præcipue debetur Deo est religiosa adoratio, ergo hæc non est tribuenda creaturæ; ergo neq; Christo, quem tu puram esse creaturam fateris*: de adorat. Christi disput. cum Christoph. Fran p. 4.

great

"great ought the difference to be between the Honour that is "exhibited to the one, and the other: But between the Crea- "tor and the Creature there is the greatest difference, whether "you respect nature and Essence, or dignity & excellency, and "therefore there ought to be the greatest difference between "the honour of the Creator and the Creature. But the honour "that chiefely is due to God, is religious worship, therefore "this is not to be given to a Creature, therefore not to Christ, "whom you confesse to be a meer Creature. This I say was his first Argument. To which *Socinus* [c] Answers: "Although "the difference between God and the Creature be the greatest, "yet it doth not follow, that the difference between their "honour must be so; for God can communicate his honour "to whom he will, especially to Christ, who is worthy of such "honour, and who is not commanded to be worshiped without "weighty causes for it.

[c] *Etsi summa est inter Deum & creaturam distantia, non tamen necesse est, tantam esse differentiam inter honorem Dei et creaturæ, nam potest Deus cui vult communicare honorem suum, Christo præsertim, qui dignus est tali honore, quiq; non sine gravissimis causis adorari jubetur in sacris literis.* disputat. de adorat. Christi. pag. 6.

§. 58. But by the favour of this *Disputant*, God cannot give that honour that is due unto him upon the account of his *Excellency* and eminency, as he is the *first* cause of all things, and the *last* end, which is the ground of divine worship, to any one, who hath not his nature; The honour due to God, cannot be given to him who is not God. His honour, the honour of him as God, is that which is due to him as *God*; now that he should give that honour, that is due to him as God, to him which is not God, is utterly impossible and contradictory to its selfe. 2. We confesse that there be most weighty causes, why Christ should be *worshiped*, yet but one *formall Reason* of that worship we can acknowledg. And therefore when *Franken* had taken off this absurd answer, by sundry instances, & Reasons, *Socinus* is driven to miserable evasions: first he cryes out, [d] *I can answer all these testimonyes:* to which when the other replyed, *And I can give a probable answer to all the texts you produce, arguing the adoration of Christ:* being driven to hard shifts he adds, [e] *I am as certaine of the truth of my*

[d] *Ad illa omnia testimonia ego possum respondere* p. 7.

[e] *Et ego ad omnes tuos locos, Christi adorationem urgentes, probabilem potero responsionem afferre.* pag. 8. [f] *De veritate meæ sententiæ tam sum certus, quam certo scio me istum pilleum manibus tenere.* pag. 9.

opinion, as I am, that I hold this hat in my hand; Which is a way of arguing that is commonly used by men that have nothing else to say. Wherefore *Franken laughs* at him, and tells him, g *Your certainty cannot be a rule of truth to me, and others, seeing another man may be found that will say, he is most certaine of the contrary opinion*; so that prevailing nothing by this meanes, he is forced to turne the Tables, & instead of an answer, which he could not give to *Frankens* Argument, to become opponent, and urge an Argument against him: saith he, *My certainty of this thing is as true, as it is true, that the Apostle saith of Christ, let all the Angels of God worship him* But by the favour of this disputant, this is not his businesse. He was to answer *Frankens* Argument, whereby he proved, that he was not to be worshiped; and not to have brought a contrary Testimony, which is certainly to be interpreted according to the issue of the Reason insisted on; and this was the end of that first Argument between them.

g *Tua ista certitudo non potest & mihi & aliis esse veritatis regula, nam reperietur alius quispiam, qui dicat, sententiam tuam contrariam ex sacris libris sibi esse persuasissimā.*

h *Tam vera est hæc de re mea certitudo, quam verum est Apostolum de Christo dixisse, adorent eum omnes Angeli.* pag. 10.

§. 59. The next Argument of *Franken*, whereby he brought his Adversarie to another absurdity, had its rise frō a distinction given by *Socinus*, about a twofold religious worship: one kind whereof without any *medium* was directed to God; the other is *yeilded* him by *Christ*, as a meanes. The first he sayes is proper to God; the other belongs to i Christ only. Now he is blind that doth not see, that for what he doth here to save himselfe, that he doth not *begge the thing in question*; who granted him that there was a *twofold Religious worship*? One of this sort, and another of that? Is it a sufficient answer for a man to repeat his own *Hypothesis*, to answer an Argument lying directly against it. 2. He grants indeed upon the matter all that *Franken* desired; namely, that Christ was not to be worshiped with that worship, wherewith God is worshiped, and consequently not with Divine. But *Franken* asks him, whether this twofold worship was of the k same kind or no? To which he answered, that it was, because it l abode not in Christ, but through him passed to God. Upon which after the interposition of another intangling *Question*, the man thus *replys* upō him. m *This then will follow, that even the*

i *Duplex est adoratio, altera quidem quæ sine ullo medio dirigitur in Deum: altera vero per medium Christum defertur ad Deum; illa adoratio est soli Deo propria, hac vero convenit Christo tantum.* pag. 11.

k *Estne utraq; adoratio ista ejusdem speciei.* pag. 11.

l *Est, quia adoratio Christi est ipsius Dei, quippe quæ in Christo non consistat, sed per eum transeat in Deum.* pag. 12. *Hoc sequetur, quod ipsius etiam Christi imago sit adoranda, quia una & eadem adoratio respicit in imaginem, tanquam medium, in Christum tanquam finem, quemadmodum Thomas Aquinas docet, a quo tuum tu commentum es mutuatus.* p. 13.

image

image of Christ is to be worshiped, because one & the same worship respects the image as the meanes, Christ as the end, as Th. Aquinas tels us, frō whom you borrowed your figment: Yet this very fancy *Socinus* seemes afterward to illustrate by taking a *book* in his hand, *sliding it along upon a Table*, shewing how it passed by some hands, where *truely it was*, but stayed not untill it came to the end: For which grosse Allusion he was sufficiently derided by his Adversary. I shall not insist on the other *Arguments*, wherewith on his own *Hypothesis* he was miserably gravel'd by this *Franken*: and after all his pretence of reason, forced to cry out, these are *Philosophicall* Arguments; and contrary to the Gospell. The Disputation is extant, with the notes of *Socinus* upon it, for his own vindication, which do not indeed one whit mend the matter. And of this matter thus farre.

CHAP. XX.

Of the Priestly Office of Christ: How he was a Priest: when He entred on his Office: and how He discharged it.

Mr BIDDLE'S 11th Chap. Examined.

HIS 11th Chapter is, concerning the *Priestly Office of Jesus Christ*. In the First and Second Question he grants Him to be a *Priest*, from (*Heb.* 4. 14.) and to be *appointed* to that Office by the Father, from *Heb.* 5. 5. The remainder of the Chapter is spent in sundry attempts to prove, that Christ *was not a Priest*, whilest he was on the *Earth*; as also to take off from the End of his *Priest-hood*, with the benefit redounding to the Church thereby. §. 1.

For the *first*, a man would suppose M. *Biddle* were faire and ingenious in his *Concessions*, concerning the *Priesthood* of Jesus Christ: May we but be allowed to propose a *few Questions* to him, and to have Answers suggested according to the Analogy of his *Faith*, I suppose his acknowledgement of this Truth will be found to come exceedingly short of what may be expe- §. 2.

&ted. Let him therefore shew, whether Christ be an *High Priest properly* so called, or only in a *Metaphoricall* sence, with respect to what he doth in Heaven for us, as the *High Priest* of old did deale for the People in their things, when he received mercy from God? Againe, whether Christ did, or doth offer a *proper* Sacrifice to God? and if so; of what kind? or only that his Offering of *himselfe* in Heaven is *Metaphorically* so called? If any shall say, that M.B. differs from his *masters* in these things, I must needs professe my selfe to be otherwise minded, because of his following attempt to exclude him from the investiture with, and execution of his Priestly Office in this life, and at his death; whence it inevitably follows, that he can in no wise be a *proper Priest*, nor have a *proper Sacrifice* to offer, but that both the one, and the other are *Metaphoricall*; and so termed in allusion to what the High Priest among the Jewes did for the *People*. That which I have to speake to, in this ensuing discourse, will hinder me from insisting much on the demonstration of this, that *Christ was a Priest properly* so called, and offered to God a Sacrifice of *Attonement*, or propitiation, *properly* so called, whereof all other Priests, and Sacrifices appointed of God, were but Types. Briefely therefore I shall do it.

§. 3. The Scripture is so *positive*, that Jesus Christ in the execution of His Office of His Mediation, *was*, and *is* a *Priest*, an *High Priest*, that it is amongst all that acknowledge him utterly out of Question. That he is not *properly* so called, but *Metaphorically*, and in allusion to the High Priest of the Jewes (as was said) the *Socinians* contend. I shall then (as I said) in the first place prove, that Christ was an High Priest *properly* so called; and then evince *when* he was so; or *when* he entred on that Office. This first is evident from that description, or *definition* of an High Priest, which the Apostle gives, *Heb.* 5. 1. *Every High Priest taken from among men, is ordained for men, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for sin.* That this is the *description* of an High Priest *properly* so called, is manifest from the Apostles accommodation of this *Office* spoken of to *Aaron*, or his exemplifying of the way of entrance thereinto, from that of *Aaron*, v. 4. And *no man taketh this Honour to himselfe, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.* That is, to be such an High Priest as *Aaron* was, which here he describes. One that had *that honour*, which

Aaron

Aaron had. Now certainly *Aaron* was an High Priest properly and truly, if ever any one was so in the World. That Jesus Christ was *such* an High Priest as is here described, yea that he is the *very* High Priest so described by the Holy Ghost, appears upon this twofold consideration. 1. In generall; the Apostle accommodates this *description*, or *description* of an High Priest to *Jesus Christ*, v. 5. *So also Christ glorified not himself, to be made a High Priest.* Were it not that *very Priesthood* of which he Treats, that Christ was so *called* to; it were easy so to reply: true! to a *proper Priesthood* a man must be *called*, but that which is *improper & Metaphorical* only, he may assume to himself, or obtaine it upon a more generall account, as all *Believers* do. But this the Apostle excludes, by comparing Christ in his Admission to this Office, with *Aaron*, who was properly so. 2. In *Particular*, all the parts of this *description* have in the Scripture a full, and compleat Accommodation unto *Jesus Christ*, so that he must needs be *properly* an High Priest, if this be the description of such an one.

1. He was *taken from amongst men.* That great *Prophesy* of him so describes him, *Deut* 18.18. *I will raise you up a Prophet from* AMONG YOUR BRETHREN. He was *taken* from *among men*, or raised up from among his Brethren. And in *particular*, it is mentioned out of what *Tribe* amongst them he was taken, *Heb.* 7.13,14. *For he, of whom these things are spoken, pertaineth to another Tribe: For it is evident, that our Lord sprang out of Juda.* And the *Family* he was of in that *Tribe*, namely that of *David*, is every where mentioned. *God raised up the horne of Salvation in the House of his Servant David*, Luk. 1.69. §. 4.

2. He was *ordained for men*, τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, as to things appointed by God: καθίσταται, is, *appointed to rule, and preside*, and *governe*, as to the things of God. This *Ordination*, or Appointment, is that after mentioned, which he had of God: his Ordination to this Office, v. 5,6. *So also Christ Glorified not himself, to be made an High Priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee, &c.* He had his Ordination from God: He who made him both *Lord and Christ*, made him also an *High Priest*; and he was made in a more solemne manner then ever any Priest was; *even by an Oath*, chap. 7.20,21. *For as much as not without an Oath, &c.* and he was so appointed *for men*, to *preside* and §. 5.

and governe them in things *appertaining to God*, as it was with the High Priest *of old*; the whole charge of the *House* of God, as to holy things, his worship, and his Service, was committed to him. So is it with *Jesus Christ*, *Heb.* 3. 6. *Christ is as a Son over his own house, whose house are we.* He is *for* us, and over *us*, in the things of the Worship, and house of God. And that he was *ordained for men*, the Holy Ghost assures us farther, chap. 7. 26. *Such an High Priest* BECAME US; he was *so*, for us: which is the first part of the description of an High Priest, *properly* so called.

§. 6. 3. The prime and peculiar end of this Office, is to *offer Gifts, and Sacrifice for sinne.* And as we shall abundantly manifest afterwards, that Christ did thus offer *Gifts, and Sacrifices for sinne:* so the Apostle professedly affirmes, that it was necessary he should do so, because he was an High Priest, chap. 8. 3. *For every High Priest is ordained to offer Gifts and Sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity, that this man have somewhat also to Offer.* The force of the Apostles Argument, concerning the *necessity* of the offering of Christ, lyes thus: Every High Priest is to offer Gifts and Sacrifices; but *Christ is an High Priest*; therefore he must have somewhat to Offer. Now if Christ was not a *Priest properly* so called, it is evident his Argument would be *inconclusive*; for from that which is *properly* so, to that which is only so *Metaphorically*, and as to some likenesse, and proportion, no Argument will lye: for instance; Every *True man* is a Rationall Creature; but he that shall thence conclude, that a *Painted* man is so, will find his Conclusion very feeble. What it is that Christ had to *Offer*, and what *Sacrifice* he offered, shall afterward be declared. The *definition* then of an High Priest *properly* so called, in all the parts of it, belonging unto Christ, it is necessary that the thing *defined* belong also unto him.

§. 7. 2. He who is a Priest, according to the *Order of a True and Reall Priesthood*, he is a True, and *Reall* Priest. Believers are called Heb. 13. 16. *Priests*, *Rev.* 1. 5. And are said to Offer up *Sacrifices* to God; spirituall Sacrifices, such as God is *pleased* with. Whence is it, that they are not Reall and *Proper* Priests? Because they are not Priests of any *Reall Order* of Priesthood, but are so called, be- 1 Pet. 2. 9. Ephes. 2. 18. cause of some Allusion to, and Resemblance of the *Priests* of Heb. 10. 22. Old, in their accesse unto God. This will also by the way dis-

cover

cover the *vanity* of them among us, who would have the *Ministers* of the Gospel, in contradistinction to other Believers, be called *Priests*. Of what Order were they, who did appropriate that appellation? The absurdity of this figment, the Learned *Hooker* could no otherwise defend, then by affirming, that *Priest* was an abbreviation of *Presbyter*. When both in truth, and in the intendment of them that used that terme, its sence was otherwise. But to returne. The Sons of *Aaron* were *properly* Priests; why so, because they were so appoynted in the *Line* of the Priesthood of *Levi*, according to the Order of *Aaron*. Hence I assume; Christ being called a Priest, according to the Order of a *True* and *proper* Priesthood, was truly, and *properly* so: *He was a Priest after the Order of Melchisedeck*, Psal. 110. 4. which the Apostle often insists on, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. If you say, that Christ is called an High Priest, after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, not *properly*, but by reason of some proportion, and Analogy, or by way of Allusion to him: you may as well say, that he was a Priest according to the order of *Aaron*; there being a great similitude between them, against which the Apostle expressly disputes in the whole 7. chap. to the *Hebrews*. He therefore was a *reall Priest*, according to a Reall and Proper Order.

3. Againe: He that was Appointed of God to Offer Sacrifices for the *sins* of men, was a Priest *properly* so called; but that Christ did so, and was so appointed, will appeare in our farther consideration of the Time, when He was a Priest, as also in that following, of the *Sacrifice* he offered; so that at present I shall not need to insist upon it. §. 8.

4. Let it be considered, that the great *medium* of the Apostolicall *perswasion* against Apostasy in that Epistle to the *Hebrews*, consists in the exalting of the Priesthood of Christ, above that of *Aaron*: now that which is *Metaphorically* only so in any kind, is cleerely and evidently *lesse* so, then that which is *properly*, and directly so. If Christ be *Metaphorically* only a Priest, He is lesse then *Aaron* on that consideration. He may be farre more excellent then *Aaron* in other respects, yet in respect of the Priesthood he is *lesse* excellent, which is so directly opposite to the designe of the Apostle in that Epistle, as nothing can be more. It is then evident on all these considerations, and might be made §. 9.

farther conspicuous, by such as are in readinesse to be added, that Christ was, and is Truly, and Properly an High Priest; which was the first thing designed for confirmation.

§. 10. The *Racovian Catechisme* doth not directly aske or answer this Question, whether Christ be an High Priest *properly* so called, but yet insinuates its Authors Judgement expressly to the contrary. "The Sacerdotall Office of Christ is placed herein, "that as by his Kingly Office he can help and relieve our ne- "cessities, so by his Sacerdotall Office he will help, and actu- "ally doth so. And this way of his helping or relieving us, is "called his Sacrifice.

* *Munus igitur Sacerdotale in eo situm est, quod quemadmodum pro Regio munere potest nobis in omnibus nostris necessitatibus subvenire: ita pro munere Sacerdotali subvenire vult, atque porro subvenit; Atq; hæc illius subveniendi, seu opis afferendæ ratio, Sacrificium ejus appellatur.* Catec. Rac. de Mun. Chr. Sacer. p. 1.

§. 11. Thus they begin. But 1. That any Office of Christ should bespeake *power* to relieve us, without a *Will*, as is here affirmed of his *Kingly*, is a proud, foolish, and ignorant fancy. Is this enough for a King among men, that he be *able* to relieve his Subjects, though he be not *willing*? or is not this a Proper description of a wicked Tyrant? Christ as a King, is as well *willing*, as *able* to save, *Isa* 32. 1. 2. 2. Christ as an High Priest, is no lesse *able*, then *willing* also, &, as a King, he is no lesse *willing*, then *able*, Heb. 7. 27. That is, as a King he is both *able* and *willing* to save us, as to the *Application* of salvation, and the meanes thereof: As a Priest, he is both *willing*, and *able* to save us, as to the *procuring* of Salvation, and all the meanes thereof. 3. It is a senseless folly to imagine, that the Sacrifice of Christ consists in the *manner* of affording us that help and reliefe, which as a King he is able to give us: such weak engines do these men apply, for the Subversion of the Crosse of Christ; but of this more afterwards.

§. 12. But they proceed to give us their whole sence, in the next Question and Answer, which are as followeth.

Quare hæc ejus opis afferendæ ratio Sacrificium vocatur?

Why is this way of his affording help called a Sacrifice?

Vocatur ita figurato loquendi modo, quod quemadmodum in prisco fœdere summus Pontifex ingressus in sanctũ sanctorum, ea

"It is called so by a figurative manner of speak- "ing, for as in the Old Covenant, the High Priest "entring into the Holiest of Holies, did do those "things, which pertained to the expiation of the

sins

"sins of the People: So Christ hath now entred "the Heavens, that there he might appeare be- "fore God for us, and performe all things that "belong to the expiation of our sins.

quæ ad expianda peccata populi spectarent, perficiebat, ita Christus nunc penetravit cælos, ut illic Deo appareat pro nobis, & omnia ad expiationem peccatorum nostrorum spectantia peragat. Heb. 2. 17. & 4. 14. & 5. 1. & 9. 24. De Mun. Chr. Sacerdot. Q. 2.

The summe of what is here insinuated, is, 1. That the *Sacrifice of Christ* is but a *figurative Sacrifice*, and so consequently, that he himselfe is a *figurative* Priest: for as the Priest is, such is his Sacrifice: *Proper*, if *proper*; *metaphorical*, if *metaphorical*; what say our Catechists for the proof hereof? they have *said* it; not one word of Reason, or any one Testimony of Scripture is produced to give countenance to this figment. 2. That the *High Priest made attonement and expiation of sinnes*, only by his *entring* into the most holy place, and what he did there: which is *notoriously* false, and contrary to very many expresse Testimonies of Scripture, *Levit.* 4. 3, 13, 21, 27. chap. 5. 16. chap 6. 5, 6, 7. *Levit.* 16. &c. 3. That Christ was not an High Priest, untill he entred the *holy place*; of which afterwards. 4. That he made not *expiation of our sinnes, untill he entred heaven, and appeared in the presence of God:* Of the Truth whereof, let the Reader consult *Heb.* 1. 3. If Christ be a *figurative* Priest, I see no reason why he is not a *figurative* King also; and such indeed those men seem to make him.

§. 13. The second thing proposed is, that Christ *was an High Priest*, whilest he was *on the the Earth*; and offered a *sacrifice* to God. I shall here first answer what was objected by M. *Biddle* to the contrary, and then confirme the truth it selfe.

I *say* then first, that Christ was a Priest, while he was on *earth*, and he continueth to be so for ever; that is, untill the whole worke of *mediation* be accomplished.

§. 14. *Socinus* first published his opinion in this businesse in his book *de Jesu Christo servatore* against *Covet.* For some time the venome of that errour was not taken notice of. *Six* yeares after, as himself telleth us, (**Epistola ad Niemojev* 1.) he wrote his *Answer* to *Volanus*, wherein he confirmed it againe at large. Whereupon *Niemojevius*, a man of his own *Antitrinitarian* infidelity, writes to him, & askes

* *Nunc annos abhinc sex atque eo amplius in eam rem exercitationem in rea de Jesu Christo servatore recta disputatione sine dubio legisti.* Faust. Socin. Ref. ad Joh. Niemojev. Ep. 1.

b askes him sharply (in substance) if he was not *mad* to affirme a thing so contrary to expresse Texts of Scripture. (*Epist. Joh. Niemojev.* 1. *ad Faust. Socin.*) Before him, that Atheisticall *Monke Ochinus* had dropped some few things in his Dialogues hereabout. Before him also *Abailardus* had made an entrance into the same abomination, of whom saves c *Bernard* (*Epistola* 190.) *Habemus in Francia novum de Doctore Magistro theologum: qui ab ineunte ætate sua in arte Dialectica lusit, & nunc in Scripturis sacris insanit.*

b *Verum non sine mœrore, (ne quid gravius addam) incidi inter legendum in quoddam paradoxon, dum Christum in morte, sive in cruce sacrificium obtulisse pernegas,* Joh. Niemojev. Epist. 1. ad Faust. Socin.

c Vide Bernard. Epist. 109.

§. 15. How the whole Nation of the *Socinians* have since consented into this notion of their *Master*, I need not manifest. It is grown one of the Articles of their Creed; (as this man here lays it down among the substantiall grounds of Christian Religion.) Confessedly on their part, the whole doctrine of the *satisfaction* of Christ, and *Justification* turnes on this hinge. For though we have other innumerable demonstrations of the *Truth* we assert, yet as to *them*, if this be proved, no more is needful For if Christ was a Priest, & offered himself a *Sacrifice* it cannot but be a *Sacrifice* of *Attonement*, seeing it was by *blood* & *death*. *Crellius* tels us, that Christ dyed for us on a double account; a *Partly as the Mediator, and surety of the New Covenant; Partly as a Priest, that was to offer himself to God.* A man might think he granted Christ to have been a *Priest* on the *Earth*, and as such to have offered himselfe a Sacrifice. So also doth b *Volkelius* allow the *killing of the Sacrifice*, to represent the death of Christ. Now the killing of the Sacrifice, was the Sacrificing of it. So *Stuckius* proves from that of the Poet, *Et nigram mactabis ovem, lucumq; revises.* But *Crellius* afterwards expounds himself, and tells us, c *that this two fold Office of Christ* (then which nothing can be spoken more ridiculously) *of a Mediator and a Preist did as it were meet in the death of Christ: the one ending,* (that is, his being a Mediatour)

a *Etenim mortem, Christus subiit, duplici ratione; partim quidem, ut fœderis mediator, seu sponsor, & veluti testator quidem partim ut Sacerdos Deo ipsum oblaturus* Crell. de caus. mort. Christi p. 6.

b *Partes hujus muneris hæc sunt potissimum; mactatio victimæ, in Tabernaculum ad oblationem peragendam ingressio, & ex eodem egressio. At mactatio quidem mortem Christi violentam, sanguinisq; profusionem continet.* Volkel de vera Relig. lib. 3 cap. 37. p. 145. c *In morte utrumq; munus (Mediatoris, & Sacerdotis) veluti coit: & prius quidem in ea definit, eaq; confirmatur postremum autem incipit, & ad id Christus fuit quodammodo præparatus.* p. 8.

and

and the other beginning. And [d] *Volkelius* doth the like; with a sufficient contradictiō to his Assertion, calling the death of Christ the *beginning and entrance of his Priesthood.* For his *Mediatorship* *Crellius* telleth us that it is most evident, that Christ therein was *subordinate to God:* so he Phrases it; that is, he was a Mediatour *with us, from God,* and not at all [e] *with God* for us. And this he proves, because he [f] *Put not himselfe into this Office, nor was put it into it by us, so to confirme the Covenant between God and us; but was a Minister and Messenger of God, who sent him for this purpose.* But the *folly* of this shall be afterwards manifested. Christ was given of God, by his *own consent,* to be a Mediatour, for us, and to lay down his life a *ransome* for us. (1 *Tim.* 2. 4, 5, 6.) which certainely he did *to God* for us, and not *for God to us,* as shall afterward be evinced. But comming to speake of his *priesthood* He is at a losse. [g] *When* (saith he) *he is considered as a Priest* (for that he was properly a Priest he denys, calling it *Sacerdotii, & oblationis metaphora*) *although he seemeth to be like one who doth something with God, in the name of men, if we consider diligently, we shall finde that he is such a Priest, as performes something with us, in the name of God.*

d *Hinc colligitur solam Christi mortem, nequaquam illā perfectam absolutamq; ipsius oblationem de qua in Epist. ad Hebræos agitur, fuisse — sed principium & præparationem quandam istius Sacerdotii in cælo demum administrandi, extitisse.* idem. ibid.

e *Jam vero satis apparet, Christum priori modo spectatum, penitus Deo subordinatum esse.* p. 6.

f *Neque enim vel ipsum ingessit, vel a nobis missus est ad fœdus inter Deum, & nos peragendum: sed Dei, qui ipsum in hunc finem miserat, minister, ac internuntius hac in parte fuit.* p. 7.

g *Cum vero consideratur ut Sacerdos, etsi similitudinem refert ejus, qui Deo aliquid hominum nomine præstet. Si tamen rem ipsam penitius spectes, deprehendes, talem eum esse sacerdotem, qui Dei nomine nobis aliquod præstet.* pag. 7.

This proofe is, παρὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν & διαίρεσιν. But this is no new thing with these men. Because Christ as an *High Priest,* doth something *with us* for God; therefore He did nothing *with God* for us. As though because the High *Priest* of old, was *over the House* of God, and *ruled* therein, therefore he did not *offer Sacrifices* to God for the sinnes of the People. All that *Crellius* in his ensuing Discourse hath to prove this by, is, because as he saith, *Christ Offered not his Sacrifice untill he came to Heaven.* Which because he proves not, nor endeavoures to do it, we may see what are the Texts of Scripture urged for the confirmation of that conceite by M. B. and others.

Seeing all the proofes collected for this purpose are out of the Epistle to the *Hebrewes,* I shall consider them in order as they lye §. 16.

lye in the *Epistle*, and not as transposed by his Questions with whom I have to do.

The first is (in his eleventh Question.) thus insinuated; *Why would God have Christ come to his Priestly Office by suffering?* According to the tenour of the Doctrine before delivered, the inference is, that until *after* his sufferings he obtained not his *Priestly* Office, for by them he entered upon it. The Answer is. *Heb.* 2. 10. 17, 18.

§. 17. *Ans.* 1. The Apostle doth not say *absolutely*, that it became Christ to be made *like us*, that he might be an *High Priest*, but that he might be a *merciful high Priest*. That is, his suffering and death were not required *antecedently*, that he might be a *Priest*, but they were required to the Excecution of that End of his Priesthood, which consists in *Sympathy* and *Sufferance* together with them, in whose *stead* he was a Priest. He sustained all his Afflictions, and death it selfe, not that he might be a *Priest*, but that being *merciful*, and having experience, he might on that account be ready to succour them that *are Tempted*; and this the words of the last verse do evidently evince to be the meaning of the Holy Ghost: *in that he suffered, being tempted.* His sufferings were to this end of his *Priesthood*, that he should be *Mercifull*, able to *succour* them that are tempted; besides, it is plainely said, that he was an High Priest εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, or ἱλάσκεσθαι τὸν θεὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, to make Reconciliation for the sinnes of the People. Now that Reconciliation was made by his death and blood the Scripture informes us, *Rom.* 5. 10. *Whilst we were enemies, we were reconciled by the death of his Sonne. Dan.* 9. 24. So that even from this place of Scripture, produced to the contrary, it is evident, that Christ *was an high Priest on Earth*, because he was so when he made reconciliation, which he did in his death on the Crosse.

§. 18. But yet M. *Biddles* candid proceedure in this businesse may be remarked; with his *Huckstering* the word of God. He reads the words in this order: *It became him to make the Captaine of their Salvation perfect through suffering; that he might be a mercifull and Faithfull high Priest.* Who would not conclude, that this is the *series* and *tenour* of the Apostles Discourse? And that Christ is said to be made perfect through *sufferings*, that he might be a mercifull High Priest. These words of *making perfect through suffering*,

ring, are part of the 10. *verse*: that he might be a Mercifull High Priest, part of the 17. Between which two there intercedes a Discourse of a businesse quite of another nature; namely, his being *made like his Bretheren* in taking on *him the seed of Abraham*, whereof these words, *that he might be a Mercifull and Faithfull High Priest*, are the immediate issue: That is, he had a body prepared him, that he might be a *Priest*, and have a Sacrifice. Our High Priest was exercised with *sufferings* and *temptations*, sayes the Apostle: Jesus was exercised with *sufferings and temptations*, that he might be our *High Priest*, sayes M. *Biddle*.

Heb. 8. 1, 2. is insisted on to the same purpose in his third Question, which is; *What manner of High Priest is Christ?* §. 19.

Ans. Heb. 8 1, 2. *We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens. A Minister of the Sanctuary, and of the true Tabernacle, &c.* I name this in the next place, because it is coincident with that of Ch. 4. 14. (insisted on by *Socinus*, though omitted by our Author.)

Hence it is inferred, that Christ entred the *Heavens* before he was an *High Priest*; and is an *High Priest* only when he is set *down at the right hand of the Majesty on High.*

Ans. That Christ *is* an high Priest *there also*, we grant? that he is so there *only*, there is not one word in the place cited to prove. *Heb.* 4. 14. saith indeed, that *our High Priest is entred into the Heavens*; but it sayes not, that he was not *our High Priest before he did so.* As the *High Priest* of the *Jewes* entred into the *Holy place*, but yet he was an *High Priest* before, or he could not have entred into it. He is such an *High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of Majesty*; that is, not like the *typicall* High Priest who dyed, and was no more; but he abides in his *Office* of Priesthood; not to *Offer Sacrifice*, for that he did once for all, but to *intercede* for us for ever.

Heb. 8. 4. is nextly produced in Answer to this Question. §. 20.

Was not Christ a Priest whilst he was upon Earth, namely when he dyed on the Crosse? Ans. Heb. 8. 4. Chap. 7. 15, 16.

The same Question and Answer is given by the *Racovian Catechisme*, and this is the *maine place* insisted on by all the *Socinians*: *For if he were on earth, he should not be a Priest, seeing that there are Priests, that offer gifts according to the Law.*

Ans.

Ans. 1. Ἐπὶ γῆς may be interpreted of the *state* and *Condition* of him spoken of, and not of the place wherein he was. If he were ἐπὶ γῆς of a meere *earthly* condition, as the High Priest of the *Jewes*, he should not be a Priest. So is the Expression used elsewhere. *Col.* 3. *v.* 2. we are commanded not to *minde* τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; that is *terrene* things, earthly things. And *v.* 5. mortify your members, τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, that is, your *Earthly* members.

2. If the word signify the place, and not the Condition of the *things*, whereof they are, they may be referred to the *Tabernacle*, of which he speakes, and not to the *High Priest*. *v.* 2. the Apostle tells us, that he is the *Minister*, or *Priest* of the *true Tabernacle*, which God made, and not man: and then *v.* 3. that in the other *Tabernacle* there were *Priests that Offered dayly sacrifices*: So that saith he, if this *Tabernacle* ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, He should not be a *Priest* of it. For in the Earthly Tabernacle there were other *Administrators*: but to passe these interpretations,

§. 21. 3. The Apostle does not say, that *He* that is upon the Earth can be *no* Priest, which must be our Adversaries Argument, if *any*, from this place, and thus formed, *He that is upon the Earth is no Priest*; Christ before his *Assension was upon the Earth*, therefore he was no Priest. This is not the intendment of the Apostle, for in the same verse he affirmes, that there *were Priests on the Earth*. This then is the utmost of his intendment; that if Christ had been only to *continue* on the Earth, and to have done what Priests did, or were to do upon the Earth, there was neither *need* of him, nor *roome* for him: but now is He a Priest, seeing he was not to *take upon him their worke*; but had an *Eternall Priest-hood* of his own to Administer. There is no more in this place, then there is, *Chap.* 7. 19, 23, 24. which is a cleare Assertion, that Christ had a *Priesthood* of his own, which was to perfect and compleat all things; being not to share with the Priests, that had all their work to do upon the *Earth*. And in *v.* 13, 14, 15. of Chap. 7. you have a full exposition of the whole matter. The summe is, Christ was *none* of the Priests of the *Old* Testament; No Priest of the Law: all their *earthly* things vanished, when he undertooke the Administration of *Heavenly*. So that neither doth this at *all* evince, that Christ

was

was not a Priest of the order of *Melchisedeck*, even before his Attention.

To this *Heb.* 7. 15, 16. is urged, and those words; *after the power of an endles Life*, are insisted on: as though Christ was not a Priest, untill after he had *ended his life*, and risen againe. §. 22.

But is this the intendment of the Apostle? Doth he aime at any such thing? The Apostle is insisting on one of his Arguments to prove from the *institution* of the Priest-hood of *Melchisedeck*, or a Priest-hood after his Order, the excellency of the Priest-hood of Christ above that of *Aaron*; from the manner of the institution of the *one* and of the other, this Argument lyes: sayes he; the Priests of the *Jewes* were made κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς, according to the *Law of a carnall Commandement*: that is, by *carnall rights* and ceremonies, by carnall *Oyle* and *Ordinances*; but this man is made a Priest after the order of *Melchisedeck*, κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, by virtue of an *endles life*; by the appointment of God, having such a life, as should never by death interrupt him in the Administration of his Office; for though the life of Christ was *intercepted* three dayes, yet his Person was never dissolved, as to the Administration of his Office of Priest-hood: which is the thing *spoken* of, and in respect of that he had an *endles life*.

Quest 9. is to the same purpose. *How did Christ enter into the Holy place to offer himselfe?* §. 23.

Ans. *By his own blood*, Heb 9. 12.

Ans. Would not any one imagine, that it was said in the Scripture, that Christ entred into the Holy place to *Offer* himselfe; that, that is taken for granted, and the *modus*, or manner how he did it, is alone enquired after? This is but one part of the Sophistry M.B. makes use of in this *Scripture Catechisme*. But it is so farre from being a true report of the Testimony of the Scripture, that the plain contrary is asserted, namely, that Christ *offered himselfe* before his entrance into the *holy place*, not made with hands, and then entred thereinto, to *appeare in the presence of God for us*. Christ entred by his *own Blood* into the holy place, in as much as having *shed* and *offered* his *blood* a sacrifice to God, with the efficacy of it he entred into *his presence*, to carry on the work of his Priesthood in his intercession for us. As the

High Priest, having *offered without*, a Sacrifice to God, entred with the *blood* of it into the most holy place, there to *perfect* and compleat the duties of his Office, in *offering*, and *interceding* for the people.

§. 24. The remaining Questions of this Chapter may be speedily dispatcht. His sixth is.

What benefit happeneth by Christs Priesthood?

Ans. Heb. 5. 9, 10.

Though the place be very improperly urged, as to an Answer to the Question proposed; there being very many more testimonyes clearly and distinctly expressing the Immediate fruits, and benefits of the Priestly Office of Christ; yet because we grant, that by his *Priesthood* principally, and eminently Christ is become the Author of Salvation, we shall not *dissent*, as to this Question and Answer. Only we adde as to the manner, that the way whereby Christ by his Priesthood became the Author of Salvation, consists principally in the Offering up of himselfe to death, in, and by the *shedding of his blood*, whereby he obtained for us Eternall Redemption, *Heb.* 9. 14, 26.

§. 25. But this M.B. makes enquiry after, Qu. 8. *How can Christ save them by his Priesthood? Ans.* Heb. 7. 25. Heb. 9. 28.

Ans. 1. We acknowledge the use of the Intercession of Christ, for the carrying on, and the compleating of the work of our Salvation: as that *also* it is the Apostles designe there, to manifest his Ability to save, beyond what the *Aaronicall* Priests could pretend unto, which is mentioned chap. 7. 25. but, that He *saves us thereby*, exclusively to the Oblation he made of himselfe at his Death; or any otherwise, but as carrying on that Work, whose foundation was laid therein, (Redemption being meritoriously procured thereby) I suppose M. B. doth not think, that this place is any way usefull to prove. And that place which he *subjoynes* is not added at all to the Advantage of his intendment: for it is most evident, that it is of the *Offering* of Christ by death, and the shedding of his blood, or the Sacrifice of himselfe, as v. 26. that the Apostle there speaks.

§. 26. There is not any thing else, that is needfull for me to insist upon in this Chapter; for though the Scripture instructs us in many other *uses*, that we are to make of the Doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ, then what he expresses in his last question, yet

yet that being one Eminent one amongst them (especially the foundation of coming with boldnesse to the Throne of Grace, being rightly understood) I shall not need to insist farther on it.

§. 27. Not to put my Selfe, or Reader to any needlesse trouble, M. B. acknowledging that Christ is an High Priest, and having opposed only his investiture with the Office, whilest he was upon the Earth, and that to destroy the Attonement made by the Sacrifice of himselfe; having proved that he was a Priest *properly* so called; I shall now prove that He *was an High Priest whilest he was upon Earth*, and shew afterwards what he had to Offer, with the Efficacy of his Sacrifice, and the Intent thereof. First, the Scripture will speedily determine the difference, *Eph.*5.2. *Christ hath loved us, and hath given himselfe for us an Offering, and a Sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour.* He that offereth Sacrifices and Offerings unto God, is a Priest: So the Apostle defines a *Priest*, *Heb:*5.1. He is one *taken from amongst men*, and ordained to offer Gifts, and Sacrifices for sinnes. Now thus did Christ doe, in his giving himselfe for us: παρέδωκεν, *he delivered* himselfe for us; To deliver himselfe, or to be delivered for us, notes his *death* alwaies, in contradistinction to any other act of his: so *Eph.*5.25. *Gal.*2.22. *Rom.* 8.32. *Rom.*4.25 ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν. In that delivery of himselfe he Sacrificed; therefore he was then a Priest.

§. 28. To this *Socinus* invented an Answer, in his Book *de Servatore*, which he insists on againe *Epist.*2. *ad Niemojev.* and whereunto his followers have added nothing, it being fixed on by them all; in particular by *Smalcius in Catech. Racov.* And yet it is in it self *ludicrous*, and almost *jocular*. The words they tell us are thus to be read, παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. and there they place a point in the verse. προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ: without any dependance upon the former words, making this to be the sence of the whole. Christ gave himselfe to death for us; and *O* what *an offering was that to God*, and *O* what a Sacrifice! that is in a *metaphoricall* sence; not that *Christ offered* himselfe to God for us: but that *Paul* called his *giving himselfe to dye*, an offering, or a thing *gratefull* to God, as good Works are called an Offering, *Phil.*4.18. That is, the Dying of Christ was *præclarum facinus*, as *Volkelius* speaks. But, *Volkel. de ver. Relig. lib.*3. *cap.* 37. *p.* 461.

1. It is easy to Answer or avoid any thing by such wayes as this; divide, cut off sentences in the dependence of the words, and you may make what sence of them you please; or none at all.

2. These words, προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν, have no other word to be regulated by, but παρέδωκεν: and therefore must relate thereunto; and Christ is affirmed in them to have *given* himself an *offering*, and a Sacrifice.

3. These words an *Offering and a Sacrifice*, are not a commendation of Christs giving himself, but an *illustration*, and a description of what he gave; that is, *himself*, a *Sacrifice* of sweet savour to God. So that notwithstanding this exception, (*becoming only them that make it*) it is evident from hence, that Christ offered himself a Sacrifice in his Death, and was therefore then a Priest fitted for that work.

§. 29. 2. *Heb.* 5.6,7. *As he saith also in another place, Thou art a Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchisedeck: who in the dayes of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong cryes and teares, unto him that was able to save him from Death.* v.6. The Apostle tells us, that he was a *Priest*, and v.7. what he did by virtue of that *Priesthood*, προσήνεγκε δεήσεις καὶ ἱκετηρίας: It is a Temple expression of the Office of a Priest, that is used. So v.1. An High Priest is appointed ἵνα προσφέρῃ, that he may *offer*. Now when did Christ do this. It was in *the dayes of his flesh, with strong cryes and teares*; both which evidence this his Offering to have been before his death, and at his death; and his mentioning of *prayers and teares*, is not so much to shew the *matter* of his Offering, which was *himself*; as the *manner*, or at least the *concomitants* of the Sacrifice of Himself, *Prayers and Teares*; and these were not for *himself*, but *for* his Church, and the business that for their sakes he had undertaken.

§. 30. 3. *Heb.* 1.3. *When he had by himself purged our sinnes, sate down at the Right hand of the Majesty on high.* The *purging of our sinnes* was by Sacrifice; There was never any other way καθαρισμοῦ; but now Christ did this *before his Ascension*: καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος, when *he had himself*, or *after* he had purged our sinnes; and that δι' ἑαυτοῦ, *by himself*, or the Sacrifice of himself. That our sinnes are purged by the oblation of Christ, the Scripture is cleare,

cleare; hence *his blood is said to wash us from all our sinnes.* And *Heb.* 10.10. *sanctified*, is the same with *purged*: and this through the offering of the body of Christ ἐφάπαξ Christ then offering this Sacrifice whilest he was on the Earth, was a Priest in so doing. 1 Joh. 1.7.

Unto this may be added sundry others of the same *import*, C. 7. 27. *Who needed not dayly, as those High Priests, to offer up Sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the peoples: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.* The *one Sacrifice* of Christ is here compared to the *dayly Sacrifices* of the Priests. Now those dayly Sacrifices were not performed in the *most holy place*, whither the High Priest entred but *once* in a yeare, which alone was a Representation of Heaven; so that what Christ did in Heaven cannot answer to them, but what he did on earth, before he entred the Holy Place, not made with hands. §. 31.

And Ch 9.12. *He entred by his own blood into the holy place,* αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος, *after he had obtained eternall redemption.* Redemption is every where in the Scripture ascribed to the *blood* of Christ. And himself abundantly manifesteth on what account it is to be had, when he says, that he gave *his life a ransome*, or a price of redemption. Where, and when Christ laid down his life, we know: and yet that our Redemption or Freedome is by the *Offering* of Christ for us, is as evident, ch. 9.26. *He puts away sinne* (which is our Redemption) *by the Sacrifice of himself*; so that this *Sacrifice of himself* was before he entred the Holy Place; and consequently He was a Priest before his entrance into Heaven. It is I say apparent from these places, that Christ *offered himself*, before he went into the Holy Place, or sate down at the *Right hand* of the *Majesty* on high, which was to be proved from them. §. 32.

4. Christ is often said to offer himself *once for all*: designing by that expression some *individuall Action* of Christ, and not such a continued *course* of proceedure, as is his presentation of himself in Heaven: or the continuation of his oblation, as to its efficacy by his Intercession; so *Heb:* 7.27. τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ. *Heb:* 9.28. ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς. &c. 10 10. v. 12, 14. In all these places the offering of Christ is not only said to be one, but to be *once offered*; now no offering of Christ, besides that which he *offered on the Earth*, can be said to be once offered. For that which is don in Heaven is done *alwayes*, and for ever; but that which is done §. 33.

alwayes

always, cannot be said to be done *once* for all. To be always *done*, or in doing, , as is Christs *offering himself* in Heaven, and to be *done once* for all, as was the Oblation spoken of in those places, whereby our *sins* are done away, are plainely contradictory: it is said to be so offered ἅπαξ, as to be opposed unto πολλάκις, whereby the Apostle expresses that of the *Aaronicall* Sacrifice, which in two other words he had before delivered; they were offered διηνεκὲς, and καθ' ἡμέραν; that is, πολλάκις, in which sence his offering himself in Heaven cannot be said to be done ἅπαξ, but only that on the Crosse. Besides, he was ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας v. 28. and how he did that we are informed, 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. Ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον: he did it in his body on the Tree.

§. 34. Besides, the Apostle *Heb.* 9. 26. tels us, that he speakes of such an offering, as was accompanied with suffering: *he must have often suffered since the foundation of the World*: It was such an *offering*, as could neither be repeated, nor continued without suffering that he treats of. We do not deny, that Christ *offers himself* in heaven; that is, that he presents *himself*, as one that was so offered, to his Father: but the Offering of himself; that was on earth, and therefore there was he a Priest.

§. 35. 5. Once more; that Sacrifice which answered those Sacrifices, whose Blood was never carried into the Holy place; that must be performed on earth, and not in Heaven. That many proper Sacrifices were offered as *types* of Christ, whose *blood* was not carried into the Holy place, the Apostle assures us, *Heb.* 10. 11. The dayly Sacrifices had none of their blood carried into the Holy place: for the High Priest went in thither only *once* in the yeare. But now these were all *true* Sacrifices and *types* of the Sacrifice of Christ; and therefore the Sacrifices of Christ also, to answer the types, must be offered before his entrance into Heaven, as was in part declared before. Yea there was no other Sacrifice of these, but what was performed in their killing and slaying, and therefore there must be a Sacrifice prefigured by them, consisting in killing and shedding of blood. All this is asserted by the Apostle, *Heb.* 7. 27. *Who needeth not daily as those High Priests, to offer up Sacrifices, for this he did once, when he offered up himself.* Those Sacrifices which were offered καθ' ἡμέραν, *dayly*, were

were types of the Sacrifice of Christ; and that of his, which was offered ἐφάπαξ, did answer thereunto; which was his death, and nothing else.

CHAP. XXI.

Of the Death of Christ, the Causes, Ends, and Fruits thereof, with an entrance into the Doctrine of his Satisfaction thereby.

MR *Biddles* 12th Chapter is concerning the *Death of Christ*, the Causes, and Fruits, and Ends thereof: The Errour and mistake whereabout, is the *Second* great head of the *Socinian* Religion; Next to his Person, there is not any thing, they set themselves so Industriously to oppose, as his Death, in the sence wherein it hath constantly hitherto been embraced by all Christians, as the great foundation of their Faith and Confidence. §. 1.

That the Lord Jesus, our Mediator, did *not* by his Death and Sufferings undergoe the penalty of the Law, as the punishment due to our sinnes, that he did *not* make Satisfaction to God, or make *Reconciliation* for Transgressours, that he *did not* thereby properly Redeeme us by the payment of a Ransome, nor so suffer for us, as that our sins should in the Justice of God be a *meritorious cause* of his suffering, is the Second Great Article of the Creed, which they * labour to assert and maintaine. §. 2.

* *Vid. Faust. Socin. de Jes. Christ. Servator. Praelect. Theol. Cap. Sac. Paræn. ad Volan. Epistola ad Niemojev. Thes. de Iustif. Smal. Ref. Thes. Pran. adv. Smigl. Nov. Monst. Catec. Rac. &c. Crelli. de Caus. Mor. Christ. Vindic. ad Grot. Volkel. Ver. Relig. Christ. Ostered. Institut. cap. 11. Schlicting. Epist. ad Hebræ. &c.*

There is not any thing about which they have laid out so much of their strength, as about this, namely, that Jesus Christ is called our *Saviour* in respect of the way of Salvation, which he hath revealed to us, and the *power* committed to Him to *deliver* us, and save us, in, and by *Obedience* required at our hands, not on the account of any *Satisfaction* he hath made for us, or Attonement by the Sacrifice of himselfe. §. 3.

How *Faustus Socinus* first broacht this opinion, with what difficulty §. 4.

difficulty he got it to be entertained, with the men of his own profession, as to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, has been before
Preface. declared. What weight he laid upon this opinion about the Death of Christ, and the opposition he had engaged in against his satisfaction, with the *diligence* he used, and the *paines* he took about the *one* and the *other*, is evident from his *writings* to this purpose which are yet extant. His Book *De Jesu Christo Servatore* is wholy taken up with this Argument; so is the greatest part of his *Prælections*; his *Lectiones Sacræ* are some of them of the same subject; & his *Paræneſis* against *Volanus*; many of his *Epistles*, especially those to *Smalcius*, and *Volkelius*, and *Niemojevius*, as also his treatises about *Justification* have the same design. *Smalcius* is no lesse industrious in the same cause, both in his *Racovian Catechisme*, and his Answers and Replys with *Franzius* and *Smiglecius*. It is the maine design of *Schlichtingius* his Comment on the *Hebrews*; *Crellius de Causis mortis Christi*, and his defence of *Socinus* against *Grotius* dwells wholy on this Doctrine. *Volkelius* hath his share in the same Work, &c.

§. 5. What those at large contend for, M. *Biddle* endeavours slily to *insinuate* into his *Catechumens* in this Chapter; Having therefore briefely spoken of *Salvation* by Christ, and of his *Mediation* in generall, in consideration of his 6, and 7. Chapters; I shall now God assisting take up the whole matter, and after a briefe discovery of his intendment in his Queries concerning the Death of Christ, give an account of our whole Doctrine of his *Satisfaction*, confirming it from the Scriptures, and vindicating it from the exceptions of his *Masters*.

§. 6. For the order of proceedure, I shall first consider M. *Biddles* Questions; then state the point in difference, by expressing what is the judgement of our Adversaries concerning the Death of Christ, and what we ascribe thereto; and then demonstrate from the Scripture the Truth contended for.

§. 7. M. *Biddles* first Question is,

Was it the will and purpose of God that Christ should suffer the Death of the Crosse? What saith the Apostle Peter to the Jews concerning this? Ans. Acts 2. 22, 23. to which he subjoynes, *What say the Disciples in generall concerning the same?* Ans. Acts 4. 24, 27, 28.

It

It is not unknown what difference we have, both with the *Socinians* and *Arminians* about the purposes and efficacious *decrees*, and the Infallibility of the Prescience of God: something already hath been spoken to this purpose, in our Discourse concerning the Prescience of God, as formerly in that of Perseverance. How unable M. *Biddles* companions are to *disentangle* themselves from the Evidence of that *Testimony*, which is given to the Truth we contend for, by these Texts which here he with so much confidence recites, hath been abundantly by others Demonstrated. I shall not here enter into the *merits* of that cause, nor shall I impose on M. *Biddle* the opinion of any other men, which he doth not expressly own; only I shall desire him to reconcile what he here speakes in his *Querie*, with what he before delivered concerning Gods *not foreseeing our free actions, that are for to come*. What God purposes shall be, and come to passe, He certainely *foresees*, that *that* will come to passe. That Christ should dy the death of the *Crosse* was to be brought about by the *free actions* of men, if any thing in the *world* was ever so, and accomplished in the same manner; yet that this should be done, yea so done, God purposed; and therefore without doubt foresaw that it should be accomplished, and so foresaw all the *free actions* whereby it was accomplished. And if he *foresee* any one free action, why not all? There being the same Reason of one and all. But at the present let this passe. His second Question is.

Did Christ dye to reconcile and bring God to us, or on the contrary, to bring us to God? Anſ. Rom. 5.10. Ephes. 2.14,16. 2 Cor. 5.19. & 1 Pet. 3.18. §. 8.

That I may (by the way) speake a little to this Question, reserving the full discussion of the matter intended to the ensueing discourse; The termes of it are first to be explained.

1. By *Reconciling* God, we intend the making of such an *Attonement*, whereby his wrath or Anger, in all the effects of it, are turned away. Though we use not the expression of *Reconciling God* to us, but of *Reconciling us to God*, by the taking away, or *removall* of his wrath, and Anger, or the making *reconciliation* with God for sinne; yet as to reconcile God, intends the appeasing of the *Justice* and *Anger* of God, so that whereas be-

fore we were obnoxious to his Displeasure, Enmity, Hatred, and Wrath thereby, and on that account we come to be accepted with him, we say Christ dyed to *reconcile* God to *Us*, which in the progresse of this Discourse with plentifull demonstrations from the Scripture shall be evinced.

§. 9. 2. Of *bringing God to us*, we speake not; unlesse by *bringing God to us*, he intends the *procurement of the Grace and Favour of God toward us, and his loving presence to be with us*, and then we say, in that sence Christ by his death brought God to us.

§. 10. 3. Our *Reconciliation to God*, or the reconciliation as it stands on our part, is our *Conversion* unto God, our deliverance from all that *Enmity* and opposition unto God, which is in us by nature; and this also we say is the effect, and fruit of the Death of Christ.

§. 11. 4. Our *bringing unto God*, mentioned 1 Pet. 3. 18. is of a larger and more comprehensive signification, than that of our *Reconciliation*: containing the whole effect of the death of Christ, in the removall of every hinderance, and the *Collation* of every thing necessarily required to the perfect and compleat accomplishment of the worke of our Salvation, and so containes no lesse the Reconciliation *of God* to us, than *ours* to him; and is *not* proper to make up one member of the division there instituted, being a generall expression of them both.

§. 12. Now concerning these things M. *Biddle* enquires, *Whether Christ by his death reconciled God to us, or on the contrary, us to God*; So insinuating, that *one* of these Effects of the Death of Christ is inconsistent with the *other*; This seemes to be the mans aime,

1. To *intimate*, that this is the state of the *difference* between him and us; that we say, Christ dyed to *Reconcile God to us*; and he, that *he* dyed to *Reconcile us to God*.

2. That these things are *contrary*; so that they who say the *one*, must deny the *other*; That *we* who say, that Christ dyed to *Reconcile God to us*, must of necessity deny that he dyed, to *Reconcile us to God*; and that he also, who saith, he dyed to *Reconcile us to God*, may, and must deny on that *account* the other effect by us ascribed to his death. But this *Sophistry* is so *grosse*, as it is not worth the while to insist upon its discovery; We say, that Christ dyed to *Reconcile God to us* in the sence before explained,

and

and *to* unto *God*; and these things are so farre from being of *any* Repugnancy one to another, as to the making up of one entire end, and effect of the death of Christ, that without them both, the worke of Reconciliation is by no meanes compleat.

Not to prevent the full proofe and evidence hereof, which is intended, it may at present suffice, that we evince it by the light of this one consideration; If in the Scripture it is expressly and frequently affirmed, that *Antecedently* to the consideration of the Death of Christ, and the Effects thereof, there is not only a *reall Enmity* on our parts against God, but also a *Law Enmity* on the part of God against us, and that *both* of these are removed by *Vertue* of the Death of Christ, then the *Reconciliation of God to us*, and our *Reconciliation to God*, are both of them one entire effect of the death of Christ. That there is in us by nature a *reall Enmity* against God, before it be taken away by the virtue of the death of Christ, and so we Reconciled to him, is not denyed; and if it were, it might be easily evinced from *Rom.* 8. 7, 8. *Tit.* 3. 3. *Ephes.* 2. 12. and innumerable other places; And certainely the evidence on the other side, that there was a *Law enmity* on the *part* of God against us, *Antecedent* to the consideration of the Death of Christ, is no lesse cleare. The great Sanction of the Law, *Gen.* 3. *Deut.* 27. 29. considered in conjunction with the Justice of God, *Rom.* 1. 32. *Hab.* 1. 13. *Psal.* 5. 4, 5, 6. 2 *Thess.* 10. 5, 6. and the Testimonies given concerning the state and condition of man in reference to the *Law* and Justice of God, *Joh.* 3. 36. *Rom.* 5. 18. *Ephes.* 2. 3, 12. &c. with the expresse assignation of the Reconciliation pleaded for, to be made by the Death of Christ, *Dan.* 9. 24. *Heb.* 2. 18. do abundantly evince it; There being then a *mutuall Enmity* between God and us, though not of the same kind, (it being *Physicall* on our part, and *Legall* or *Morall* on the part of God,) Christ our Mediatour making up *peace* and friendship between us, doth not only *Reconcile* us to God, by his Spirit, but God also to us, by his blood; but of this more afterward under the consideration of the death of Christ, as it was a *Sacrifice*. §. 13.

For the Texts cited by *M. Biddle*, as making to his purpose, the most, if not all of them looke another way then he intends to use them. They will in the following Chapter come under §. 14.

full consideration. Rom. 5. 10. *When we were enemies we were Reconciled to God by the death of his Sonne*; is the first mentioned. That our *being Reconciled to God*, in this place doth not intend our Conversion to him, and our deposition of the *Reall enmity*, that is in us against him, but our Acceptance with him, upon the account of the Attonement made in the *blood* of Christ, whereby he is Reconciled to us, is evident from sundry *circumstances* of the place. For

1. That which is called *being reconciled by his death*, in 10. is *being justifyed by his blood, vers.* 9. The observation of the same *Antithesis* in both verses makes this evident. Now to be justifyed by the *blood* of Christ, is not to have our *enmity* with God slaine and destroyed (which is our Sanctification) but our *Acceptation* with God upon the account of the shedding of the blood of Christ for us; which is his Reconciliation to us.

2. We are thus Reconciled, when we are *enemies*, as in the verse insisted on; *when we were enemies we were Reconciled*; Now we are not Reconciled in the sence of *deposing our Enmity* to God (that deposition being our Sanctification) *whilest we are enemies*, and therefore it is the Reconciliation of God to us, that is intended.

3. *Verse* 11. we are said to receive this *Reconciliation*; or as the word is rendred, the *Attonement*; the word is the same with that used *v.* 10. Now we cannot be said to *receive our own conversion*, but the *Reconciliation of God* by the blood of Christ, his *favour* upon the Attonement made, that by Faith we do receive; Thus M. *Biddles* first Witnesse speakes expressly against him, and the designe for the carrying on whereof he was called forth; as afterward will more fully appeare.

Καταλλαγὴν

§. 15. His second also of *Ephes.* 2. 14, 16. speakes the same language; *He is our peace, who hath made both one, that we might reconcile both unto God in one body, by the death of his Crosse, having slaine the enmity thereby*; Setting aside the *joynt designe* of the Apostle to manifest the Reconciliation made of *Iewes* and *Gentiles* by the Crosse of Christ, it is evident, the *Reconciliation* here meant consists in *slaying* the *enmity* mentioned, so making peace; Now what is the enmity intended? Not the *Enmity* that is in our hearts to God, but the *Legall enmity* that lay against us, on the part of God; as is evident from *v.* 15. and the

the whole designe of the place, as *afterwards* will appeare more fully.

There is indeed 2 *Cor.*5.18,19,20. mention made of Reconciliation *in both the senses insisted on; of us to God, v.* 20. where the Apostle saith, the end of the ministry is to *reconcile us to God*; to prevaile with us to lay down *our enmity* against him, & opposition to him; of *God to us*, v.19 *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*; which to be the import of the words is evinced from the *exegeticall expression* immediately following; *not imputing to them their sins & transgressions*; God was so reconciling the world unto himself in Christ, as that upon the account of what was done in Christ, He will not *impute* their sins to them; The *Legall enmity* he had against them, on the account whereof alone mens sinnes are imputed to them, being taken away. And this is farther cleared by the summe of his former Discourse, which the Apostle gives us *v* 21. declaring how *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*; For (saith he) *he made him sin for us who knew no sinne, that we might be made the Righteousnesse of God in him*; Thus he was in *Christ reconciling the world to himself*, in that he *made him to be sinne*, or a sacrifice for sinne, so to make an Attonement for us, that we might be accepted before God, as Righteous on the account of Christ. §. 16.

Much lesse doth that of the 1 *Pet.*3.18. In the last place mentioned, speak at all to M.B's purpose: *Christ hath once suffered for sinne, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God*; *bringing to God*, is a generall expression of the Accomplishment of the whole work of our Salvation, both in the removall of all *hinderances*, and the *collation* of all things necessary to the fulfilling of the work: Of this the Apostle mentions the great *fundamentall*, and procuring cause, which is the *suffering of Christ* in our stead; the *just for the unjust*: Christ in our stead suffered for our sinnes, that he might *bring us to God*; Now this suffering of Christ in our stead, for our sinnes, is most eminently the cause of the Reconciliation of God to us; and by the *intimation thereof*, of our Reconciliation to God, and so of our *Manuduction* to him. §. 17.

Thus, though it be most true, that Christ Dyed to Reconcile us to God, by our conversion to him, yet all the places cited by M. *Biddle* to prove it, (so unhappy is he in his Quotations) §. 18.

speake to the defence of that Truth, which he doth oppose, and not of that which he would assert; and which by asserting in opposition to the Truth, with which it hath an eminent consistency, he doth corrupt.

§. 19. The next Question I shall not insist upon; It is concerning the *object* of the death of Christ, and the Universality thereof; The words of it are, *For whom did Christ dye?* The Answer is from 2 *Cor.* 5. 14, 15. 1 *Tim.* 5. 6. *Heb.* 2. 9. *Joh.* 6. 8. where mention is made of *all*, and the *World*, in reference to the death of Christ. The Question concerning the *object* of the Death of Christ, or whom he dyed for, hath of late by very many been fully discussed; and I have my selfe spoken elsewhere some-
Salus Electorum sanguis Jesu. what to that purpose; It shall not then here be insisted on; In a word, we confesse that Christ died for *all*, and for the *World*; but whereas it is very seldome that these words are comprehensive of *all and every man in the World*, but most *frequently* are used for *some of all Sorts*, they for whom Christ died, being in some places expounded to be the *Church*, *Believers*, *the Children*, *those given unto him out of the World*, and no where described by any terme expressive constantly of an *absolute Universality*, we say the Words insisted on are to be taken in the *latter* sence, and not the *former*; being ready, God assisting, to put it to the issue and tryall with our Adversaries, when we are called thereunto.

§. 20. He proceeds; *What was the procuring cause of Christs death?*

Ans. *Rom.* 4. 25. *Isa.* 53. 5. 1 *Cor.* 15. 3. The Expressions are; That *Christ was delivered for our offences*, that *Christ died for our sinnes, and was bruised for our iniquities.*

That in these, and the like places, that clause *for our sinnes, offences*, and *transgressions*, is expressive of the *procuring cause* of the death of Christ, M. B. grants; *Sinne* can be no otherwise the *procuring cause* of the death of Christ, but as it is morally *meritorious* thereof. To say *our sinnes were the procuring cause of the death of Christ*, is to say, that our sinnes *merited* the death of Christ; And whereas this can no otherwise be, but as our sinnes were imputed to him, and he was put to death for them, M. B. hath in this one Question granted the whole of what in this subject he contends against. If our sinnes were the *procuring cause* of the death of Christ, then the *death* of Christ was that *punishment* which

which was due to them; or in the Justice, or according to the tenour of the Law of God, was *procur'd* by them; and so consequently, He in his death underwent the *penalty* of our Sinnes, suffering in our stead, and making thereby *satisfaction* for what we had done amisse: M. *Biddles* Masters say generally, that the expression of, *dying for our sinnes*, denotes the *finall* cause of the death of Christ; that is, Christ intended by his death to confirme the *Truth*, in obedience whereunto we shall receive *forgiveneſſe of sinnes*; This grant of *M.* B's, that the *procuring cause* of the Death of Christ is hereby expreſt, will perhaps appeare more Prejudiciall to his whole cause, then he is yet aware of; especially being proposed in distinction from the *finall* cause, or end of the Death of Christ, which in the next place he mentions, as afterward will more fully appeare; although I confesse he is not alone; *Crellius* making the same concession. Crellius de Causis Mortis Christi. p. 13.

The last Question of this Chapter is, *What are the ends of Christs suffering and Death intimated by the Scripture?* Whereunto by way of Answer, sundry Texts of Scripture are subjoyned; every one of them expressing some one end or other, some *effect* or *fruit*, something of the aime and intendment of Christ in his suffering and Death; whereunto exceeding many others might be annexed. But this businesse of the death of Christ, its Causes, Ends, and Influence into the work of our Salvation, the manifestation that therein he underwent the *punishment due* to our sinnes, making *attonement*, and giving satisfaction for them, *redeeming* us properly by the *price* of his blood, &c. being of so *great weight* and importance as it is, lying at the very bottome, and foundation of all our hope and confidence, I shall, leaving M. *Biddle*, handle the whole matter at large in the ensuing Chapters. §. 21.

For our more cleere and distinct proceedure in this Important head of the Religion of Jesus Christ, I shall first lay downe the most Eminent Considerations of the Death of Christ, as proposed in the Scripture; and then give an Account of the most *Speciall* Effects of it in particular, answering to those Considerations of it; in all manifesting wherein the *expiation* of our *sinnes* by his blood doth consist.

The Principall Considerations of the Death of Christ, are of

of it, { 1. As a PRICE. 2. As a SACRIFICE. 3. As a PENALTY.

Of which in the order wherein they are mentioned.

CHAP. XXII.

The severall considerations of the Death of Christ, as to the Expiation of our sinnes thereby, and the satisfaction made therein: First, of it as a Price. Secondly, as a Sacrifice.

§. 1. 1. THe Death of Christ in this businesse is a *Price*: and that *properly* so called: 1 *Cor.* 6.20 ἠγοράσθητε τιμῆς *you were bought with a Price*; and if we will know what that *Price* was, with which we are bought; the Holy Ghost informes us, 1 *Pet.* 1. 17, 18. *ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ. It is the blood of Christ*, which in this businesse hath that use which *silver and gold* have in the Redeeming of Captives: And paid it is into the hand of him, by whose Power and Authority the Captive is detained, as shall be proved: And himselfe tells us what a *kind of Price* it is, that is so paid; it is λύτρον, *Mat.* 20.28. *He came to lay downe his life*, λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν; which for its more evidence and cleerenesse, is called ἀντίλυτρον, 1 *Tim.* 2.6. *A Price of Redemption*, for the delivery of another.

§. 2. The first mention of a *Ransome* in the Scripture is in *Exod.* 21.30. *If there be laid on him a summe of money, then he shall give for the Ransome of his life, what ever is laid on him*: the word in the Originall is כֹּפֶר, which the Septuagint there render λύτρα; δώσει λύτρα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ: and it is used againe in the same sence, *Ps.* 49. 9. and in both places intends a *valuable price*, to be paid for the deliverance of that, which upon guilt became obnoxious to death. It is true, the word is from כָּפַר *redimere, vindicare, asserere in libertatem*, by any wayes and meanes, by Power, Strength, or otherwise. But where ever it is applyed to such a kind of Redemption, as had a *Price* going along with it, the *Septuagint* constantly render it by ἀπολύτρωσιν, and sometimes

λυ-

λυτρώσεως, otherwise by ἱλασμὸν, and the like.

It is then confessed, that פדה in the Old Testament, is sometimes taken for *redemit* in a Metaphoricall sence, not strictly and literally, by the intervention of a Price; but that λυτρώσασθαι, the word whereby it is rendred, when a Price intervened, is ever so taken in the New Testament, is denyed. Indeed *Moses* is called λυτρωτὴς, *Acts* 1.35. in reference to the Metaphoricall Redemption of *Israel* out of *Ægypt*: a deliverance by Power and Strong Arme; but shall we say because that word is used improperly in *one* place, where *no* price could be paid, where God plainly saies, it was not done by a Price, but by Power, therefore it must be so *used* in those places, where there is expresse mention of a Price, both the Matter of it, and its formality as a Price, and speaketh not a word of doing it any other way, but by the *payment of a Price*. But of this afterward. §. 3.

There is mention of a Ransome in ten places of the Old Testament; to *ransome*, and *ransomed*, in two or three more. In two of these places, *Exod.* 21. 30. and *Psal.* 49. 7. the word is פדיון from פדה as before, and rendred by the *Septuagint* λύτρον, in all other place it is in the Hebrew כפר, which properly signifies a *propitiation*, as *Psal.* 49. 7. which the LXX have variously rendred. Twice it is mentioned in *Job.* Ch. 33. 24. and Chap. 36. 18. In the first place, they have left it quite out, and in the latter so corrupted the sence, that they have rendred it altogether *unintelligible*, *Prov.* 6. 35. & 13. 8. they have properly rendred it λύτρον, or a *price of Redemption*, it being in both places used in such businesse, as a Ransome useth to be accepted in: Chap. 21. 8. They have properly rendred it to the subject matter: περικάθαρμα περικαθάρματα, are things publickely *devoted* to destruction, as it were to turne away *Anger* from others, coming upon them for their sakes. §. 4.

So is κάθαρμα, *Homo piacularis pro lustratione & expiatione patriæ devotus*; whence the word is often used as *scelus* in *Latine*, for a wicked man, a man fit to be destroyed and taken away χρῆζον ἢ κὴ πλημμάτων ἅ καθάρματός, saies he in the Poet, καθαρμὸς is used in the same sence by *Herodotus*, καθαρμὸν τῶν χαρῶν ποιεύμενον Ἀχαιῶν, Ἀδάμαντα τὸν Αἰόλου, *Aikaman* was made a *piacular*, or a propitiation for the Countrey. Whence *Budæus* renders that of the Apostle, ὥσπερ περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐγενήθημεν: *nos tanquam* §. 5. Aristoph. in Plut.

piacula mundi facti sumus, & succidaneæ pro populo victimæ. *we are as the accursed things of the World, and Sacrifices for the people:* reading the
1 Cor. 4.13. words, ὥσπερ καθάρματα: nos ὡς περικαθάρματα. The Greek *Scholiast*, who read it as we commonly do, rendring it by ἀποσκεύσματα; as the vulgar Latine *purgamenta*, to the same purpose; such as have all manner of filth cast upon them.

§. 6. And *Isaiah* 43.3. They have rendred the same word ἄλλαγμα, a *commutation* by *price*; so *Mat.*16.26. τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς: a Price in exchange. Now in all these places and others, the Hebrews use the word כֹּפֶר a *propitiation*, by way of Allusion; as is most especially evident from that of *Isaiah*, I will give *Ægypt a propitiation for thee*; That is, as God is attoned by a *propitiatory Sacrifice*, wherein something is offered him in the room of the Offender, so will he do with them; put them into trouble, in room of the Church, as the *Sacrificed Beast* was in the room of him for whom it was Sacrificed; and hence does that word signify a *Ransome*, because what God appointed in his *Worship* to *redeeme* any thing, that by the Law was *devoted*, which was a compensation by his institution, (as a clean beast in the room of a first born was to be offered a Sacrifice to God) was so called. And the word *satisfaction*, which is but once used in the Scripture, or twice together, *Num:* 35.31. is כֹּפֶר in the Originall. כֹּפֶר indeed is Originally *Pitch* or *Bitumen*: Hence what God saies to *Noah* about making the Arke, וְכָפַרְתָּ *Gen.*6. 14. the *Septuagint* have rendred ἀσφαλτώσεις τῇ ἀσφάλτῳ *bituminabis bitumine.* כָּפַר *in Pihel*, is *placavit, expiavit, expiationem fecit*; because by Sacrifice sins are Covered, as if they had not been; to cover or hide, being the first use of the word.

§. 7. And this is the rise and use of the word *Ransome* in the Scripture, both פְּדוּת פָּדוֹן and כֹּפֶר which are rendred by λύτρον, περικάθαρμα, ἀντίλυτρον, ἄλλαγμα: it denotes properly a *price* of Redemption, a *valuable compensation* made by one thing for another, either in the Native signification, as in the case of the first word; or by the first Translation of it from the Sacrifice of Attonement, as in the latter. Of this farther afterwards in the businesse of Redemption. For the present it sufficeth, that the death of Christ was a Price or Ransome, and these are the words whereby it is expressed.

2. It

2. It was a *Sacrifice*; & what *sacrifice* it was shall be declared. §. 8.

1. That Christ offered a *sacrifice*, is abundantly evident from what was said before, in the consideration of the *time* and *place*, when, and wherein Christ was an *high Priest*. The necessity of this the Apostle confirmes *Heb.* 8. 3. *For every high Priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.* If he be a *Priest*, he must *have a Sacrifice*. The very nature of his employment requires it. The whole and entire office & employment of an High Priest, as a *Priest*, consists in *offering Sacrifice*, with the performance of those things, which did necessarily precede and follow that Action. *It is of necessity that that he should also have somewhat to offer as a sacrifice to God.*

For the other part of our inquiry, *viz. What* it was that he §. 9.
Sacrificed; I shall manifest in this order of processe, (taking leave to inlarge a little in this, intending not so much the thing, proved before, as the manner of it.)

1. He was not to *offer any Sacrifice*, that any Priest had offered before, by Gods appointment.
2. He *did not* actually *offer* any such Sacrifice.
3. I shall shew positively what he did offer.

1. He was not to offer any Sacrifice that the Priests of old had appointed for them to offer. He came to do *another manner of worke*, then could be brought about with the blood of *Bulls* and *Goats*. It cost more to *redeeme our soules*. That which was of more *Worth* in it selfe, of neerer concernement to him that offered it, of a more manifold *Alliance* to them for whom it was offered, and of better *acceptation* with God to whom it was offered, was to be his Sacrifice. This is the aime of the Holy Ghost, *Heb.* 10. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. 6, 7. *For the Law &c.*

This is the summe of the Apostles Discourse; *The Sacrifices* §. 10.
instituted by the Law, could not effect, nor worke that which Christ our High Priest was to accomplish by his Sacrifice: and therefore he was not to *offer* them; but they were to be abolished, and *something* else to be brought in that might supply their roome and defect.

What was wanting in these *Sacrifices*, the Apostle ascribes to §. 11.
the *Law*, whereby they were instituted. *The Law could not do it*, that is, *the Ceremoniall Law could not do it.* The Law which instituted and appointed these Sacrifices, could not accomplish that

end of the institution, by them: And with this expression of it he subjoynes a reason of this *weakenesse* of the Law. *It had a shaddow of good things to come, and not the very Image of the things themselves.* An obscure representation of those *good things*, which when they were instituted and in force, were μέλλοντα to come; though now actually exhibited, and existent: that is, *Jesus Christ himself*, and the good things of the Gospell accompanying of him. It had but a shaddow of these things, not the *image*; that is, the substance of them; for so I had rather understand *Image* here *substantially*; as that may be called the *image* of a *picture*, by which it it drawn; then to make σκιὰ and εἰκὼν here to differ but gradually, as the first *rude shape* and proportion, and the *perfect limning* of any thing do. The reason then why al the solemn, *operous*, burdensome service of old, could not (of it selfe) take away sin, is because it did not containe *Christ* in it, but only had a shaddow of him.

§. 12. 2. The Apostle instances in *particular*, by what means the Law *could not do this* great worke of *making the commers thereunto perfect*. Τὸς προσερχομένους, that is, those who *come to God* by it, the *worshippers*; which is spoke in opposition to what is said of Christ, *Chap.7.25. He is able to save to the uttermost* Τὸς προσερχομένους, *those that come to God by him.* The word expresseth any man under the consideration of one *coming to God* for Acceptation. As *Heb.11.6. He that cometh unto God* δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον; these it could not make perfect; that is, it could not *perfectly attone* God, and take away their sinnes, so that the conscience should no more be troubled, nor tormented with the *guilt* of sinne, as *v.2,4.* By what could not the Law do this? By those Sacrifices *which it offered yeare by yeare continually.*

§. 13. Not to speake of *Sacrifices* in generall. The *Sacrifices* of the *Jewes* may be referred to 4. heads.

1. The *dayly Sacrifice* of *morning* and *evening*, which is instituted *Exod.29.38,39.* which being omitted, was renewed by *Nehemiah: 10.33.* And wholly *taken away* for a long season by *Antiochus* according to the Prophesy of *Daniel*, *Dan.11.31.* this is the *juge sacrificiũ* typifying Christs constant presence with his Church, in the benefit of his death always.

2. *Voluntary* and *occasionall*, which had no prefixt time, nor matter; So that they were of such Creatures as God had allowed

allowed to be sacrificed, they were left to the will of the Offerer, according as Occasion and necessity was by providence administred. Now of these Sacrifices there was a peculiar Reason, that did not (as farre as I can finde) bellong unto any of the rest. The *judiciall* government of that Nation being as their own Historian *Josephus* calls it, Θεοκρατία; and immediately in the hand of God; He appointed these *voluntary Sacrifices*, which were a part of his Religious worship, to have a place also in the *judiciall government of the People*. For whereas he had appointed death to be the punishment due to every sinne; He allowed that for many sinnes, *Sacrifice* should be offered, for the expiating of the guilt contracted in that *Commonwealth*, of which himself was the Governour. Thus for many sinnes of *ignorance*, and *weakness*, and other *Transgressions*, Sacrifice was offered, and the guilty Person *dyed* not, according to the generall tenour of the Law, *cursed is every one that continueth not in all these things*. Hence *David* in his great sinne of murther and Adultery flyes to meere Mercy acknowledging, that God had appointed no *Sacrifice* for the Expiation of those sins, as to the guilt *politicall*, contracted in that commonwealth, though otherwise, no sinnes nor sinners were excluded from the *benefit* of Sacrifices. This was their *politicall* regard, which they *had*, or *could* have only on this account; that God was the *supream politicall Governour* of that people, their Lord, and King. Psal. 51. 16.

3. Sacrifices *extraordinary* on solemne occasions: which seeme some of them to be *Mixed* of the two former kinds: *stated* and voluntary. Such was *Solomons* great Sacrifice at the *Dedication of the Temple*. These partly answered the Sacrifice, instituted at the *dedication of the Altar and Tabernacle*, partly the *free will offerings*, which God allowed the people, according to their occasions; and appointed them for them. §. 14.

4. *Appointed Sacrifices* on solemne dayes: as on the *Sabbath*, *new moones*, *passover*, *feast of weeks*, *lesser and greater Jubilee* but especially the solemn *Anniversary* Sacrifice of expiation, when the High Priest entred into the Holy place, with the *blood of the beast Sacrificed*, on the *tenth day* of the month *Tizri*. The institution of this Sacrifice you have *Levit.* 16. throughout. The matter of it was *one Bullock*, and *two Goats*, or Kids of Goats, *v.* 2, 5. The *manner* was this, 1. In the entrance *Aaron* offered one §. 15.

Bullock peculiarly for himselfe and his house, *v.6.* 2. Lots were cast on the two *goats*, one to be a *sinne offering*, the other to be *Azarel*, *v.8.9.* (3.) The *Bullock* and *goate* being slaine, the blood was carryed into the *Holy place.* (4.) *Azarel* having all the sinnes of the people confessed over him, was sent into the *Wildernesse* to perish; *v.21.* (5.) The end of this Sacrifice was *Attonement* and cleansing, *v.* 30. Of the whole nature, ends, significancy, and use of this Sacrifice (as of others) elsewhere; at present, I attend only the *Thesis* proposed.

§. 16. Now if perfect *Attonement* and Expiation might be expected from any of the *Sacrifices* so instituted by God, certainely it might be from this: therefore this doth the Apostle choose to instance in. This was the Sacrifice offered καθ' ἐνιαυτὸν, & εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς: but these saith he could not do it; the *Law* by them could not *do it*, and this he proves with two Arguments.

1. From the Event *vers.* 2, 3. *For then would they not have ceased to be offered; because that the worshipper once purged, should have had no more conscience of sin? But in these Sacrifices, there was a remembrance made againe of sinnes every yeare.* The words of the second verse are to be read with an *Interrogation*, conclusive in the negative: *would they not have ceased to have been offered?* That is certainely they would; and because they did not do so, it is evident from the *Event*, that they could not take away sinne. In most Copys the words are, ὅτι ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι Those that adde the *negative particle* οὐκ, put it for ἢ οὐχὶ, as it is frequently used.

2. From the nature of the thing it selfe, *v.* 4. *For it was not possible, that the blood of Bulls and Goats should take away sinne*; the Reason in these words is evident and plaine, especially that of *v.* 4. There is a twofold impossibility in the thing.

1. In regard of *Impetration*; it was impossible they should really *attone* God, who was provoked. 1. The conjunction between the sinner and the Sacrificed Beast, was not such, or so neere (being onely that of possessour and possessed,) that really and beyond *Representation*, and *Type*, the blood of the one could satisfy for the sinne of the other. Much lesse secondly, was there an *innate worth* in the blood of any *beast*, though never so innocent, to attone the justice of God, that was offended at sinne: *Mich. 6. 6, 7.* Nor thirdly, was there any will in them

them for such an undertaking, or commutation. The Sacrifice was *bound with cords to the hornes of the Altar; Christ went willingly to the sacrifice of himself.*

2. In regard of *application.* The blood of Common Sacrifices being once shed, was a *dead thing*, and had no more worth nor efficacy: it could not possibly be a *living way* for us to come to God by; nor could it be preserved, to be *sprinkled upon* the conscience of the sinner.

Hence doth the Apostle make it evident, in the *first* place, §. 17. that Christ was not to offer any of the *Sacrifices* which former *Priests* had offered, because it was utterly impossible, that by such Sacrifices, the end of the Sacrifice which he was to offer, *should* be accomplished. This also he proves.

2. Because God had expresly *disallowed* of those Sacrifices, as to that *End*; not only it was impossible in the *nature* of the thing it self, but also God had absolutely rejected the tender of them, as to the taking away Sinne, and bringing sinners to God. But it may be said, did not God *appoint* them for that end and purpose, as was spoken before; the end of the Sacrifice in the day of *expiation* was (*Levit.*16.30.) to *attone*, and *cleanse*; *On that day shall the Priest make an atonement for you to cleanse you.* (for the Priest made an Attonement actively, by offering the Sacrifice: the Sacrifice its self Passively, by undergoing the penalty of Death; Christ, who was both Priest & Sacrifice, did both) I answer; they were never appointed of God for to accõplish that End, by any *reall* worth, and efficacy of their own, but meerly to *typify*, *prefigure*, and point out *him*, and *that*; which did the *Work*, which they represented; and so *served* as the Apostle speaks, *until the time of Reformation, Heb.*9. 10. they served the use of that people, in the *under-age* Condition, wherein God was pleased to keep them.

But now that God rejected them as to this end and purpose, §. 18. the Apostle proves by the Testimony of *David*, speaking of the Acceptance of Christ, *Psalm.* 40. 6,7. *Sacrifice and offering thou diddest not desire, mine eares hast thou opened; burnt-offering, and sin-offering hast thou not required: Then said I, lo I come, &c.* which the Apostle insists on, v. 6,7,8,9. There are several accounts, upon which God in Scripture is said to disregard, & not to *approve* or *accept* of Sacrifices, which yet were of his own Institution. 1. In respect

of

of the Hypocrisy of the offerers: That people being grown *formall*, and *corrupt*, *trusted* in Sacrifices, and the Worke wrought in them, and said by them, they should be justified; God expressing his indignation against such Sacrificers, or the Sacrifices of *Such* Persons, rejects the *things* themselves wherein they trusted, that is, in reference to *them* that used them. This is the intention of the Holy Ghost, *Isaiah* 1. 12, 13. but this is not the cause of their rejection in this place of the Psalmist; for he speaketh of them who *walked with God* in uprightnesse, and waited for his Salvation; even of himselfe and other Saints, as appears in the Context, v. 5. &c. 2. *Comparatively*: they are rejected as to the *outward Work* of them, in comparison of his more *spirituall* Worship; as *Psal.* 50. 12, 13, 14. but neither are they here rejected on that account; nor is there mention of any *opposition* between the outward Worship of Sacrifice, & any other more Spirituall and internall part thereof: but between *Sacrifice*, and the *boring of the eare*, or *preparing of the body of Christ*, as expressly, v. 6.

§. 19. Their Rejection then here mentioned, is, in reference to that which is asserted, in opposition to them, and in reference to the end, for which that is asserted: look to what end Christ had a *Body* fitted and prepared for, and to that end, and the compassing of it, are all Sacrifices *rejected* of God: now this was to *take away* sinne, so that as to that end are they rejected.

§. 20. And here in our passage may we remove what the *Racovian* Catechisme gives us, as the difference between the *expiation* under the *Old* Testament, and that under the *New*, concerning which, *Chap. de Mun. Ch. Sacerdot. q.* 5. they thus enquire.

Quodnam est discrimen inter Veteris, & Novi fœderis peccatorum expiationem?

Expiatio peccatorum sub novo fœdere, non solum distat ab expiatione peccatorum sub vetere plurimùm, verum etiam longe præstantior, & excellentior est. id vero duabus potissimum de causis: prior est, quod sub vetere fœdere, iis tantum peccatis expiatio, per illa legalia Sacrificia, consti-

What is the difference between the expiation of sinne in the Old and New Testament?

"The expiation of sinnes under the New Testament, is not only much different from that "under the Old, but also is farre better, and "more excellent: and that chiefely for two causes: The first is, that under the Old Testament, "expiation by those legall Sacrifices was appointed only for those sinnes, which happened "upon imprudence and infirmity; from whence "they were also called infirmities and ignoran-

ces

"ces. But for greater sinnes, such as were ma-
"nifest transgressions of the command of God,
"there were no Sacrifices instituted, but the pu-
"nishment of Death was proposed to them: & if
"God did forgive such tc any, he did not do it
"by vertue of the Covenant, but of singular
"mercy, which God besides the Covenant did
"afford, when, and to whom he would: but un-
"der the New Covenant, not only those sinnes
"are expiated, which happen by imprudence,
"and infirmity, but those also, which are trans-
"gressions of most evident commands of God,
"whilest he who happened so to fall, doth not
"continue therein, but is changed by true repen-
"tance, and falleth not into that sinne againe.
"The latter cause is, because under the Old Te-
"stament, expiation of sinnes was so performed,
"that only temporall punishment was taken a-
"way from them, whose sinnes were expiated.
"But under the New, the expiation is such, as
"not only takes away Temporall, but Eternall
"punishment, and in their stead, offer Eternall
"life promised in the Covenant, to them whose
"sinnes are expiated. Thus they.

tuta fuit, quæ per imprudentiam, vel per infirmitatem admissa fuere, unde etiam infirmitates, & ignorantiæ nuncupabantur: verum pro peccatis gravioribus, quæ transgressiones erant mandati Dei manifestæ, nulla sacrificia instituta fuerant, sed mortis pœna fuit proposita. Quod si talia Deus alicui condonabat, id non vi fœderis fiebat, sed misericordia Dei singulari, quam Deus citra fœdus, & quando, & cui libuit exhibebat: sub novo vero fœdere peccata expiantur, non solum per imprudentiam & infirmitatem admissa, verum etiam ea, quæ apertissimorum Dei mandatorum sunt transgressiones, dummodo is, cui labi ad eum modum contigerit, in eo non perseveret, verum per veram pœnitentiam resipiscat, nec ad illud peccatum amplius relabatur. Posterior vero causa est, quod sub prisco fœdere ad eum modum expiatio peragebatur, ut pœna temporaria tantum ab iis, quorum peccata expiabantur, tolleretur: sub Novo vero ea est expiatio, ut non solum pœnas temporarias, verum etiam aternus amoveat, & loco pœnarum, æternam vitam in fœdere promissam, iis quorum peccata fuerint expiata offerat. De Mun. Ch. Sacerdot. q. 6.

Some briefe Animadversions will give the Reader a cleare account of this discourse. 1. Sundry things are here splendidly supposed by our Catechists, then which nothing could be imagined or invented more false: as (1.) That the Covenant was not the same for Substance under the Old and New Testament, before and after the coming of Christ in the flesh. (2.) That those under the Old Testament were not *pardoned* or saved by Christ. (3.) That death Temporall was all that was threatned by the Law. (4.) That God *forgave sinne*, and not *in*, or *by* the Covenant. (5.) That there were no promises of *Eternall life* under the Old Testament, &c. on these and the like §. 21.

like goodly principles, is this whole discourse erected: let us now consider their Assertions: The first is;

§. 22. 1. That *expiation* by legall Sacrifices was only for *some* sins, and not of *all*: as sinnes of infirmity and ignorance, not great crimes; wherein 1. They *suppose*, that the *legall Sacrifices* did by themselves, and their own *efficacy*, *expiate sinne*, which is directly contrary to the discourse of the Apostle now insisted on. (2.) Their affirmation hereon is most false: *Aaron* making an Attonement for sinne, confessed over the Goat ALL THE INIQUITIES of the Children of Israell, and *ALL their Transgressions, in all their sinnes*, *Levit.* 16. 21. and besides, all manner of sinnes are *comprised* under those expressions of *Ignorances* and *Infirmities*.

2. They say, *for greater sinnes there was then no expiation, but death was threatned to them.* But then 1. None that ever committed *such* sinnes were saved; for without *expiation* there is no Salvation. 2. Death was threatned, and inflicted without mercy for some sinnes, as the Law with its *judiciall additaments* was the Rule of the *Judaicall Politie*; and for those sinnes, there was no Sacrifice for a *deliverance* from *death Temporall*; but Death was threatned to every sinne, small and great, as the Law was a Rule of Morall obedience unto God; and so in respect of *Sacrifices* there was no distinction. This *difference* of Sacrifices for some sins, and not for others in particular, did depend meerly on their use by Gods appointment in the *Common-wealth* of that People, and had no regard to the *spirituall expiation* of sinne, which they typified.

3. That God forgave the sinnes of his people of old, by *singular mercy*, and not by vertue of his Covenant, is a bold figment. God exercises no *singular* mercy, but in the Covenant thereof: *Eph.* 2. 12.

4. Their condition of Expiation (by the way) under the New Testament, *that the sinner fall not againe into the same sinne*, is a *matter* that these men understand not; but this is no place to discusse it.

5. That the Expiation under the Old Testament reached only to the removall of *temporall punishment*, is another imagination of our Catechists. It was *death eternall* that was threatned, as the punishment due to the *transgression* of the Law, as it

was

was the Rule of obedience to God, as hath been proved; even the death that Christ delivered us from, *Rom.* 5.12, &c. *Heb.* 2. 14,15. God was *attoned* by those Sacrifices, according to their way of making Attonement, *Levit.* 16.30. so that the punishment avoided was *Eternall* punishment. 2. Neither is this indeed spoken by our Catechists, as though they believed any punishment should be *Eternall*; but they only *hide* themselves in ambiguity of the expression, it being *annihilation* they intend thereby. 3. The *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* of this discourse is, that *expiation by Sacrifices* was no other, then what was done really by the Sacrifices themselves, so everting their *typicall* nature and institution, and devesting them of the efficacy of the blood of Christ, which they did represent.

6. It is confessed, that there is a difference between the *Expiation* under the Old Testament, and that under the New; but this of *Application* and *manifestation*, not of *impetration* and *procurement*: This is Jesus Christ, the same *yesterday, to day, and for ever.*

But they plead proofe of Scripture for what they say in the ensuing Question. §. 23.

How doest thou demonstrate both these?

"That the sinnes, which could not be expiated under the Old Testament, are all expiated under the New, *Paul* witnesseth, *Act.* 13.38,39. and the same is also affirmed, *Rom.* 3. 25. *Heb.* 9.15. But that sinnes are so expiated under the New Testament, as that also Eternall punishment is removed, and life Eternall given, we have *Heb.* 9.12.

Qua ratione vero utrumq; demonstras?

Peccata quæ sub vetere fœdere expiari non potuere omnia sub Novo expiari testatur Apostolus Paulus, in Actis, cap. 13. 38, 39. *idem habetur* Rom. 3. 25. Heb. 9. 15. *Quod vero ea ratione expientur peccata sub novo fœdere, ut etiam æterna pœna amoveatur, & vita æterna donetur, habetur* Heb. 9.12. *ubi sup.* Q. 7.

This work will speedily be at an issue. 1. It is denied, that *Paul Act.* 13.38,39. makes a distinction of sins, whereof some might be expiated by *Moses* Law, and others not. He says no more there, then in this place to the *Hebrews*, namely, that the *Legall Sacrifices*, wherein they rested and trusted, could not of themselves free *them*, or their *Consciences* from sin, or give them Peace with God; being but Types and Shaddowes of *good things to come*; the Body being Christ, by whom alone *all Justification* from sinne is to be obtained. Absolutely the Sacrifices of the

Law Expiated no sinne, and so were they rested in by the Jews. Typically they expiated all, and so *Paul* calls them from them to the Antitype (or rather thing Typifyed) now actually exhibited.

§. 24. 2. The two next places of *Rom.* 3. 25. *Heb.* 9. 15. do expressly condemne the Figment they strive to establish by them; both of them assigning the *pardon* of sinnes that were past, and their Expiation, unto the Blood and Sacrifice of Christ; though there were then *purifications, purgations, sacrifices*, yet the *meritorious*, and *efficient* cause of all Expiation, was the blood of Christ, which manifests the Expiation under the Old and New Testament for *substance* to have been the same.

3. That the Expiation under the *New Testament* is accompanied with deliverance from *Eternall punishment*, and a grant of life Eternall, is confessed; and so also was that under the Old, or it was no Expiation at all, that had respect *either* to God, or the *soules* of men: but to proceed with the Sacrifice of Christ.

§. 25. This is the *first thing* I proposed, Christ being to *offer* Sacrifice, was not to offer the *Sacrifice* of the *Priests* of old; because they could never bring about what he aimed at in his Sacrifice; it was *impossible* in the nature of the thing it selfe, and they were expressly, as to that end, *rejected* of God himselfe.

§. 26. 2. Christ as a *Priest did never Offer* these Sacrifices; it is true! as one *made under the Law*, and whom it became to *fulfill all righteousnesse*, he was present at them: but as a *Priest* he never offered them; for the Apostle expressly affirmes, that he *could not be a Priest, that had right to offer those Sacrifices*, as before; and he positively refuses the owning himselfe for such a *Priest*, when having cured the Leprous man, he bad him goe *shew himselfe to the Priest according to the Law.*

§. 27. 3. What Christ did offer indeed, as his Sacrifice, is nextly mentioned. This the Apostle expresseth in that which is asserted, in opposition to the Sacrifices rejected, *Heb.* 10. 5. *But a body hast thou prepared me.*

The words in the Psalme are in the sound of them otherwise, *Psal.* 40. 6. אזנים כרית לי *mine eares hast thou digged:* which the *Septuagint* render, and the Apostle from them, σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι; *a body hast thou prepared me*; Of the accommodation of the Interpretation to the Originall, there is much contention,

tention; some think here is an Allusion to the *custome* among the Jewes, of *boring the eare* of him, who was upon his *own consent* to be a Servant for ever. Now because Christ took a Body to be *obedient*, and a *servant* to his Father this is expressed by the *boring of the eare*, which therefore the *Septuagint* renders *by preparing a body*, wherein he might be so obedient; but this to me seems too curious on the part of the Allusion, and too much *strained* on the part of the Application, and therefore I shall not insist on it.

Plainly, חרה signifies not only in its first sence to *dig*, but also to *prepare*, and is so rendred by the *Septuagint*; now whereas the Originall expresseth only the *eares*, which are the *organ* by which we heare, and become obedient, (whence to *heare* is sometimes as much as to be *obedient*) it mentions the *eare Synecdochically*, for the *whole body*, which God so prepared for obedience to himselfe: and that which the Originall expressed *Synecdochically*, the *Septuagint*, and after them the Apostle, rendred more plainly and fully, naming the *whole body* wherein he *obeyed*, when the *ears* were only expressed, whereby he *learned* obedience.

The Interpretation of this place by the *Socinians*, is as ridi- §. 28.
culous, as any they make use of; take it in the words of * *Volkelius*. "Adde hereto that the "mortall body of Christ, which he had before "his death, yea before his Ascension into Hea- "ven, was not fit for his undergoing this Office "of Priesthood, or wholly to accomplish the "Sacrifice: wherefore the divine writer to the "Hebrews Chap. 10. 5. declareth, that then he "had a perfect body, accommodated unto this "work, when he went into the World; that is, to "come, which is Heaven. An heap of foolish Abominations. 1. The truth is; no body, but a Mortall body was fit to be this Sacrifice, which was to be accomplished, according to all the types of it, by shedding of blood, without which there is no remission. 2. It is false, that Christ had a *mortall body* after his Resurrection; or that he hath any other *body* now in Heaven, then what he rose withall. 3. It is false, that the World, spoken of *simply*, doth any

* *Adde quod corpus mortale, quo Christus ante mortem, imo ante suum in cælum ascensum præditus erat, ad hoc Sacerdotium obeundum, & sacrificium penitus absolvendum, aptum non fuit; ideoq; tunc demum corpus, huic rei accommodatum, perfectum ei fuisse, divinus Author indicat*, Heb. 10. 5. *cum in mundum, nempe futurum illum, qui cælum est, ingrederetur*. Volkel. de vera Relig: lib. 3. cap. 37. de Sac. Christi. p. 146.

any where signify the *World to come*, or that the World here signifies Heaven. 4. It is false, that the *coming into the World*, signifies *going out of the world*: as it is here interpreted. 5. Christs bringing into the world, was by his *Incarnation* and birth, *Heb.* 1. 6. according to the constant use of that expression in the Scripture, as His Assension is his *leaving the world*, and going to his Father, *Joh.* 13. 1. Cap. 14. 19. Cap. 16. 28.

§. 29. But I must not insist on this; it is the *Body* that God prepared Christ for his obedience, that is, his whole *humane nature* that is asserted for the *matter* of Christs offering. For the clearing whereof the Reader m ay observe, that the matter of the Offering, and Sacrifice of Christ is expressed three wayes.

1. It is said to be of the *body* and *blood* of Christ: *Heb.* 10. 10. The offering of the *body of Jesus*, and the *blood of Christ*, is sayd to
1 John 1. 7. purge us from our sinnes, that is, by the Sacrifice of it; and
Ephes. 1. 13. in his blood have we Redemption, and by his own *blood did he enter into the Holy place*, *Heb.* 9. 12. and most expressly, *Heb.* 13. 12.

2. His *Soule*: *Isa.* 53. 10. *when thou shalt make his soule an offering for sinne.*

3 It is most frequently sayd to be *himselfe* that was offered. *Eph.* 5. 2. & *Heb.* 1. 3. *Heb.* 9. 14. & *v.* 15. & *v.* 26. *Heb.* 7. 27. Hence it appeares, what was the *matter* of the Sacrifice of this *High Priest*; even *Himselfe*; he *Sacrificed himselfe*; His whole *humane nature*; he offered up his *body* and *soule*, as a propitiatory Sacrifice to God; a Sacrifice for *Attonement* and expiation.

§. 30. Further to cleare this, I must desire the Reader to take notice of the import of this expression: *He sacrificed himselfe*; or *Christ Sacrificed himselfe*. He in the first place, as it is spoken of the *Sacrificer*, denotes the *Person* of Christ, and both natures herein: *himselfe* as the Sacrificed, is only the *humane nature* of Christ wherein, and whereof that Sacrifice was made. He makes the *Attonement actively* as the Priest; Himselfe *passively*, as the Sacrifice.

1. He is the *Person of Christ*, God and man joyntly and *distinctly* acting in the worke.

1. As God, *Heb.* 9. 14. through *the Eternall Spirit he offered himselfe to God*; His Eternall Spirit, or *Deity*, was the principall Agent, *offering*; and whereever there is mentioning of *Christs offering*

offering himselfe, it relates principally to the *person*, God man, who offered.

2. The *free will* of his humane nature was in it also; So *Heb.* 10.7. *Lo! I come to do thy will*; when God had prepared him a *body*, *opened his eares*, he sayes, *Lo I come to do thy will*; as it was *written* of him in the *volume of Gods book*; and that this expression *Lo I come to do thy will*, sets out the readinesse of the *humane will* of Christ, is evident from that Exposition which is given of it, *Psal.* 40. 8. *yea thy Law is within my heart*, or in the *midst of my bowels*; Thy *Law*, the Law of the *Mediatour*, that I am to undertake, it is in the *midst of my heart*: which is an expression of the *greatest readinesse* and willingnesse possible. *He* then that offers is our Mediatour, God and man in one Person; and the offering is the act of the Person.

2. *Himselfe* offered, as the matter of the Sacrifice, is only the *humane nature* of Christ, *Soule* and *Body*, as was said; which is evident from the description of a Sacrifice, what it is. §. 31.

A Sacrifice is a *Religious oblation, wherein something by the Ministry of a Priest, appointed of God thereunto, is dedicated to God, and destroyed, as to what it was, for the ends and purposes of Spirituall worship whereunto it is instituted.* I shall only take notice of that one part of this definition, which asserts that the *thing* Sacrificed was to be *destroyed* as to what it was. This is cleare from all the Sacrifices that ever were: either they were slaine, or burnt, or sent to destruction. Now the person of Christ was not dissolved; but the *Union* of his natures continued; even then when the *humane nature* was in it selfe destroyed, by the *Separation* of Soule and Body. It was the Soule and Body of Christ that was Sacrificed; his body being killed, and his soule separated; so that at that season it was destroyed as to what it was; though it was impossible he should be detained by death.

And this Sacrifice of Christ, was *typyfied* by the *two Goats*, his body, whose blood was shed, by the Goat that was slaine visibly, and his soule by *Azazel*, on whose Head the sinnes of the people were confessed, and he is sent away into the Wilderness to suffer there by a fall or famishment. §. 32.

This also will farther appeare in our following consideration of the Death of Christ, as a *punishment*; when I shall shew, that he suffered both in *Soul* and *Body*.

But

But it may be sayd, if only the *humane nature* of Christ was offered, how could it be a *Sacrifice* of such infinite value, as to the justice of God, for all the sinnes of all the Elect, whereunto it was appointed.

Answ. Though the thing Sacrificed was but finite, yet the person sacrificing was *infinite*; and the ἀποτέλεσμα of the Action followes the Agent; that is, our *Mediatour* θεάνθρωπος; whence the Sacrifice was of infinite value.

And this is the second consideration of the Death of Christ, it was a Sacrifice; what is the peculiar influence of his death as a Sacrifice, into the satisfaction he hath made, shall be declared afterwards.

§. 33. From what hath been spoken, a briefe *Description* of the Sacrifice of Christ, as to all the *concernements* of it may be taken.

1. The person *designing*, *appointing*, and *instituting* this Sacrifice, is God the Father; as in *grace* contriving the great work of the Salvation of the Elect: A *body did he prepare him*; and therein he came to do his Will (*Heb.* 10. 9.) In that which he did, which the Sacrifices of old could not do. He came to fulfill the *Will* of God, his Appointment, & Ordinance, being his Servant therein; made βραχύ τι lesse then the *Father*, that he might be Obedient to death: God the Father sent him when He made his *soule* an offering.

2. He to whom it was *offered*, was God; God *Essentially* considered, with his glorious Property of Justice, which was to be *attoned*: *He gave himselfe a sacrifice to God*, for a sweet smelling savour: *Eph.* 5. 2. that is, to *attone* Him being provoked, as we shall see afterwards.

3. The person Offering was *Christ* the Mediatour, God and man: *He offered himselfe to God*: *Heb.* 9. 14. And because He did it, who *was* God and man, and as God and man, *God* is sayd to *redeeme his Church with his own blood*, Act. 20. 28.

4. The *matter* of the sacrifice was his whole *humane Nature*, body and soule, called himselfe, as I have shewed, in sundry particulars.

5. The *immediate efficient* cause of his offering, and the destruction of that which he offered unto God, as before described, was his own will: *Lo! I come* (saith he) *to do thy will*: and

no

no man (saith he) *taketh my life from me; I lay down my life, and I have power to take it up againe*, Joh. 10. 17, 18. What men or Divells did to him, as what he suffered from the Curse of the Law, comes under another Consideration, as his Death was a *penalty*: as it was a Sacrifice his *own will* was all the cause immediately effecting it.

6. The fire that was to set this *Holocaust* on a flame, was the *Holy Spirit*, Heb. 9. 14. Through the *Eternall Spirit*; that the fire which came down from Heaven, & was alwayes kept *alive* upon the Altar, was a type of the Holy Ghost, might easily be demonstrated. I have done it elsewhere. Now the Holy Spirit did this in Christ; he was *offered through the Eternall Spirit*; as others were by fire.

7. The Scripture speakes nothing of the *Altar*, on which Christ was offered. Some assigne the *Crosse*; That of our Saviour is abundantly sufficient to evince the folly thereof: *Matth.* 23. 18, 19. If the Crosse was the *Altar*, it was *greater* then Christ, and *Sanctified him*, which is Blasphemy. Besides, Christ himselfe is said to be an *Altar*. *Heb.* 13. 10. and he is said to *Sanctify himselfe to be an offering or a Sacrifice* Joh. 17. 19. So that indeed the *Deity of Christ*, that supported, bore up, and sanctifyed the *humane nature* as offered, was the Altar; and the *Crosse* was but an instrument of the *Cruelty* of man, that taketh place in the Death of Christ as it was a penalty, but hath no place in it as a Sacrifice.

That this Sacrifice of Christ was a *Sacrifice* of propitiation, as made by blood, as answering the *Typicall* Sacrifices of old; that the end and effect of it was Attonement or *Reconciliation*, shall elsewere be more fully manifested: the Discovery of it also will in part be made, by what in the ensuing Discourse shall be spoken about Reconciliation its selfe.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of the Death of Christ, as it was a punishment, and the Satisfaction made thereby.

§. 1. SO is the Death of Christ revealed as a Price, and a Sacrifice; what are the proper effects of it, under these considerations, shall be afterward declared.

The 3d consideration of it, is, its being a *penalty*, or a *punishment*. To clear this, I shall demonstrate foure things.

1. What *Punishment* properly so called, is.

2. That Christs death was a *punishment*, or that in his *Death* he did undergoe punishment.

3. What that was that Christ underwent, or the *materiall* cause of that *punishment*.

4. Wherein the formallity of its being a punishment did consist; or whence that dispensation had its equity.

For the first. I shall give the *definition* of it, or the *description* of its generall nature.

§. 2. 2. The Ends of it are to be considered.

Si non reddit faciendo, quod debet, reddet patiendo quod debet. August. lib. 3. de lib. *Arbit.*

For the first, that usuall generall description seemeth to be comprehensive of the whole nature of punishment; it is, *malum passionis, quod infligitur ob malum actionis*, An evill of suffering inflicted for doing evill. Or more largely to describe it; it is an Effect of *justice* in *him*, who hath soveraign Power and Right, to order and dispose of *offenders*, whereby he that doth contrary to the Rule of his actions, is recompenced with that which is evill to himselfe, according to the demerit of his fault.

§. 3. Vid. Diat. de just. Vindic. Δικὴ τιμωρίας ἀπαίτησις ἀπὸ τῶν προηδικηκότων. *Hier.*

1. It is an *Effect* of Justice; hence Gods punishing is often called an inflicting of Anger: as *Rom.* 3 5. is God unrighteous, ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; *who inflicteth Anger?* Anger is put for the justice of God, *Rom* 1. 18. the *Anger*, or Wrath of *God is revealed from Heaven*, &c. That is, his *vindictive justice* against sinne is manifested by its effects; and againe, the Cause for the *Effect*. Anger for the *effect* of it in punishment. And therefore we have

have translated the word *vengeance*, *Rom.* 3.5. which denotes the *punishment* it selfe.

2. It is of him, who hath Soveraigne Power, and Judiciary Right to dispose of the Offenders; and this is either *immediate* in God himselfe, as in the case whereof we speake: He is the only *Law giver, who is able to save, and to destroy, Jam.* 4.12. or it is by him *delegated* to men, for the use of humane Society; so Christ tells *Pilate*, he could have no *Power* over him (whom he considered as a Malefactor) *unlesse it was given him from above*, *Joh.* 19.11. though that is spoken in reference to that peculiar dispensation. §. 4.

3. The *Nature* of it consists in this, that it be *evill to him*, on whom it is inflicted; either by the *immission* of that which is Corrupting, vexing, and destroying, or the *substraction* of that which is *cheering*, usefull, good, and desireable, in what kind soever: And therefore did the Antients call punishment *fraus*, because when it came upon men, they had deceived, and cut short themselves of *some good*, that otherwise they might have enjoyed. So the Historian, *Cæteræ multitudini diem statuit, antequam liceret sine fraude ab armis discedere*: that is, that they might go away *freely*, without *punishment*. And so is that expression explained by *Ulpian*, *Dig. lib.* 20. *Capitalem fraudem admittere, est tale aliquid delinquere, propter quod, capite puniendus sit.* §. 5. Salust. bell. Catil.

The Schoolemen have two Rules that passe amongst them without controll. 1. That *Omne peccatum est adeo voluntarium, ut si non sit voluntarium non est peccatum.* It is so of the nature of sin, that it be *voluntary*, that if any thing be not *voluntary*, it is not sinne. The other is, *est ex natura pœnæ ut sit involuntaria*: it is so of the nature of Punishment, that it be *against the will* of him that is punished that if it be not so, it is not punishment. §. 6.

Neither of which Rules is *true*, yea the latter is undoubtedly *false*. For the *first*, every sinne is thus farre indeed *voluntary*, that what is done *contrary* to the expresse will of him that doth it, is not his sinne: but that the *actuall will*, or willing of the sinner is required, to make any thing *his* sin, is false. In the case of *originall* sinne manifestly: wherefore *John* gives us another definition of sinne then theirs is, that it is, *dictum, factum, concupitum contra legem*; namely, that it is *ἀνομία*, *a transgression of the Law*; have it the actuall consent of the will or no, if it be a

Transgression of the Law, an inconformity to the Law, it is sinne.

For the *latter*, it is true indeed, that for the most part it falls out, that every one that is to be punished, is unwilling to undergoe it; and there is an improper *nolleity* (if I may so speak) in nature, unto the *subtracting* of any good from it, or the *immission* of any evill upon it; yet as to the perfection of the nature of *punishment*, there is no more required, then what was laid down in generall before, that there be *malum passionis, ob malum actionis*, a suffering of evill for doing of evill, whether men will or no. Yea men may be willing to it, as the Souldiers of *Cæsar* after their defeat at *Dyrrachium*, came to him, and desired that they might be punished, *more antiquo*: being ashamed of their flight. But what ever *really* or personally is evill to a man, for his *evill* is punishment; though chiefely among the *Latines*, punishment relates to things *reall*: capitall revenges had another name. Punishments were chiefely *pecuniary*, as *Servius* on that of *Virgil: Post mihi non simili pœna commissa luetis: luetis: persolvetis: & hic sermo a pecunia dejcendit, antiquissimæ enim pœnæ omnes pecuniariæ fuerunt.* And *supplicium* is of the same importance. Punishments were called *supplicia*, because with the mulcts of men, they sacrificed, and made their supplications to God; whence the word is sometimes used for that worship; as in *Salustius*, describing the old *Romans*, he says they were in *suppliciis Deorum magnifici.*

Quanta fortitudine dimicaverint, testimonio est, quod adverso semel apud Dyrrachium prælio, pœnam in se ultro depoposcaunt. Sueton. in Jul. Cæs. cap. 68.

More patrio decimari voluerunt. Appianus.

§. 7.

4. There is the procuring cause of it, which is, *doing evill*, contrary to the Law and Rule, whereby the Offender ought to walk, and regulate his actings and proceedings: *omnis pœna, si justa est, peccati pœna est*, sayes *Aug.* indeed not only *si justa est*, but *si pœna est*; taking it properly, Offence must precede punishment.

And whatever evill befalls any, that is not procured by offence, is not properly punishment, but hath some other *name* and nature. The name *pœna*, is used for any thing that is *vexatious* or troublesome, any *toyle* or *labour*, as in the *Tragedian*, speaking of one who *tired* himselfe with travaile in hunting: *Quid te ipse pœnis gravibus infestus gravas* but *improperly* is it thus used. This *Abraham* evinceth in his plea with God, *Gen.* 18. 25. *That be farre from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with*

Senec. Hippol. Act. 2.

the

the wicked; and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be farre from thee: shall not the judge of all the Earth do right? It is of God as the Judge of all the Earth of whom he speakes; that is, of him that hath the *supreame power* of disposing of offenders; and of his Justice inflicting; which as I said, was the cause of punishment. It is that, *whereby God doth right:* and he gives the *procuring cause* of all punishment, the *wickednesse* of men: that be farre from thee, to *destroy the righteous with the wicked.* And therefore that place of *Job*, chap 9. 22. *This is one thing, therefore I said it, he destroys the perfect and the wicked:* Is not to be understood *absolutely*, but according to the *subject* of the dispute in hand, between him and *Bildad. Bildad* sayes, chap 8. 20. That *God will not cast away a perfect man.* that is, he will not *afflict a godly man* to death. He grants that a Godly man may be afflicted, which *Eliphas* his companion seemed to deny: yet sayes he, he will not *cast him away*, that is, leave him without relief from that Affliction, even in this Life. To this *Jobs* answer is, *this is one thing*; that is, one thing I am resolved on, and therefore *I said it*, and will abide by it, *he destroyeth the perfect and the wicked:* not only Wicked men are destroyed, and cut off in this life, but Perfect men also; but yet in this very destruction, as there is a difference in the persons, one being *perfect*, the other *wicked*: So there is in Gods dealing with them; one being afflicted to the doore of *Heaven*, the other *cursed* into Hell. But for punishment *properly so called*, the cause is sinne, or the offence of the person punished. And therefore in the *Hebrew*, the same words (many of them) signify both sin & punishment, so neer & indissoluble is their relation. Προσήκει δήπουθεν ὡς χρέα κληρονομίας διαδέχεσθαι τὴν πονηρείας τὴν κάλασιν. *Plut. de Serâ Numin. vindicta.*

5. The measure of any penalty, is the demerit of the offence: it is a rendring to men, as *for* their works, so *according* to them §. 8.

Nec vincet Ratio hoc, tantundem ut peccet, idemq;
Qui teneros caules alieni fregerit horti
Et qui nocturnus Divum Sacra legerit. Adsit
Regula, peccatis quæ pœnas irroget æquas,
Nec scutica dignum, horribili sectere flagello.

Hor. Sa. lib. 1. 3.

Vid. Catonis orat. apud Salust. Bel. Catalin.

I shall not trouble the *Reader* with the Heathens Apprehension of *Rhadamanthean Righteousnesse*, and the exact rendring to every

one according to his Desert even in another world.

There is a twofold Rule of this proportion of sinne and punishment: The one *constitutive*, the other *declarative*. The Rule *constitutive* of the proportion of penalty for sinne, is the *infinitely wise*, Holy, and Righteous will of God. The Rule *declarative* of it is the *Law*.

For the first, It is his Judgement *that they which commit sinne are worthy of Death*, Rom. 1. 32. This the Apostle fully declares: Chap. 2. 5, 6, 7, 8. 9, 10. The day of punishing, he calls the *day of the Revelation of the Righteous Judgement of God*. That is, what his Judgement is concerning the demerit of sinne. The world shall then know, what in Justice he requires for the due *vengeance* of it. And this according to his *Will*, *v.* 6. He will in his Righteous judgement render to every one according to his deeds.

And here it is to be observed, that though there be an exceeding great *variation* in *sinne*, in respect of degrees, so that some seeme as *mountaines*, others in comparison of them but as *molehils*, yet it is the *generall nature* of sinne, (which is the Creatures subducting its selfe from under the Dominion of God, and dependance upon him,) that punishment originall is suited unto: Whence death is appointed to every sinne, and that eternall; wherein the *degrees* of punishment vary not the kind.

§. 9. *Puniendis peccatis tres esse debere causas existimatum est. Una est quæ νουθεσία vel κόλασις vel παραίνεσις dicitur: cum pœna adhibetur castigandi atq; emendandi gratia, ut is qui fortuito deliquit, attentior fiat, correctiorq;. Altera est, quam ii, qui vocabula ista curiosius diviserunt, τιμωρίαν appellant, ea causa animadvertendi est, quum dignitas authoritasq; ejus, in quem est peccatum, tuenda est, ne prætermissa animadversio contemptum ejus pariat, & honorem elevet. &c.* vid. A. Gell. lib. 6. cap. 24.

2. * For the severall *kinds* of punishment (I call them so, in a generall acceptation of both words) they are distinguished according to their ends, and Causes the ends of punishments, or all such things as have in them the *nature* of punishments, may be referred to the ensuing heads.

1. The first End of punishment, is, the *good of him that is punished*, and this is twofold. 1. For *Amendment*, and recovery from the evill, and sinne that he hath committed. This kinde of punishing is frequently mentioned in Scripture; so eminently *Levit.* 26. doth the Lord describe it at large, and insist

sists upon it, reckoning up in a long *series*, a Catalogue of severall judgements; he interposing, *But if ye shall not be* REFORMED *by these things, but will walke contrary to me*, as *v.* 25. then will I do *so*, and *so*, or adde this, or that punishment to them foregoing: and this in reference to the former end of their *Reformation*; & the successe of this proceedure we find variously expressed: sometimes the end of it in some measure was fulfilled, *Psal.* 18. 32. 33, 34, 35. sometimes otherwise, *Isai.* 1. 5. *Why should you be smitten any more? you will revolt more and more*; intimating, that the end of the former *smiting* was to cure their revoltings. And this kinde of punishment is called [x] νουθεσία, correction for instruction; and is not punishment in its strict, and proper sence.

[x] Καὶ γὰρ ἡ νουθεσία καὶ ὁ ψόγος ἐμποιεῖ μετάνοιαν καὶ αἰσχύνην. Plut. de virtut.

§. 10.

2. For the taking off of sinners, to *prevent* such other *wickednesses* as they would commit, should patience be exercised towards thē. The very *Heathen* saw, that he that was wicked & not to be *reclaimed*, it was even *good* for him, & to him, that he should be destroyed. Such an one as *Plutarch* says, was, ἑτέροις γε πάντως βλαβερὸν αὐτῷ τε βλαβερώτατον, *hurtfull to others*, but most of all to *himself*. How much more is this evident to *us*, who know that future judgements shall be *proportionably* encreased to the wickednes of men in this world; & if every *drop* of Judgement in the world to come, be incomparably greater, then the greatest & heaviest a man can possibly suffer in this life, or loose his life by, it is most evident, that a man may be punished with *death* for his own good: *mitius punientur*. This is κολασία And this hath no place in humane Administrations of punishments, when they arise to death it selfe: men cannot *kill* a man, to prevent their *dealing worse* with him, for that is their worst; they can doe no more sayes our saviour; but accidentally it may be for his good. Generally κόλασις, or κολασία, is as *Aristotle* speakes πάσκοντος ἕνεκα: and is thereby differenced from τιμωρία (of which afterwards) which as he says, is τοῦ ποιοῦντος ἕνεκα ἵνα ἀποπληρωθῇ. Hence ἀκολάστος, is one not corrected, not restrained, *incastigatus*. And therefore the punishment of death cannot at all properly be κόλασις: but cutting off by God to prevent farther sinne, hath in it τὶ ἀνάλογον thereunto.

Arist. Rhet. 1.

§. 11.

2. The second end of punishment, which gives a second kind of them in the generall sence before mentioned, is for the

the *good of others*, and this also is various.

1. For the *good of them that may be like minded* with him that is punished; that they may be deterred, affrighted, and perswaded from the like evills. This was the end of the punishing of the presumptuous sinner, *Deut.* 17.12,13. *That man shall dye, and all the people shall heare, & feare, and do no more presumptuously.* The people; that is any among them that was like minded unto him that was stoned & destroyed. So in some places they have taken *Lions* that have destroyed men, and hung them on crosses, to fright others that should attempt the like. Hence *exemplum*, is sometimes put absolutely for punishment because punishment is for that end. So in the *Comedian*, *Quæ futura exemplia dicunt in eum indigna*: on which place *Donatus*, *graves pœnæ, quæ possunt cæteris documento esse, exempla dicuntur.* And this is a tacite end in human punishment. I do not know that God hath committed any *pure Revenge* unto men: That is, punishing with a *meere* respect to what is past. Nor should one man destroy another, but for the good of others. Now the good of no man lyes in revenge. The content that men take therein, is their sin, and cannot be *absolutely* good to them. So the *Philosopher*, *nemo prudens punit quia peccatum est, sed ne peccetur; revocari enim præterita non possunt, futura prohibeantur.* And *Rom.* 13.4. *If ye do that which is evill, be afraid, &c.* See what he hath done to others, and be afraid.

Terent. Eunuch. Ac. 5. Sce. 4.

Sen.

§. 12.

2. It is for the good of others, that they may not be hurt in the like kind, as some were by the sin of him who is punished for it. This seems to be the main end of that great *fundamental Law* of humane society, *Let him that hath killed by violence be killed*, that the rest of men may live in peace. And these kinds of punishments in reference to this end are called παραδείγματα, Examples: that others by impunity be not enticed to evil, and that the residue of men may be freed from the harme that is brought upon them, by reason of such evils.

Naturale jus talionis hic indicatur. Grot. in Gen. 9. 6.

Inde παραδειγματικὸς συλλογισμὸς, & παραδειγματικὸν ἐνθύμημα.

Hence the Historian sayes, that Commonwealths should rather be mindfull of *things done evilly*, then of *good turnes*: the forgetfulnesse of the latter, is a discouragement to *some good*, but of the former an encouragement to all licentiousnesse. Thus *Joseph* suspecting his espoused consort, yet refused παραδειγματίσαι, to make an open example of her by punishment. And these punish-

Math. 1. 19.

punishments are thus called from their use, and not from their own nature: and therefore differ not from κολασίαι and τιμωρίαι, but only as to the end and use from whence they have their denomination.

Κολάσατε καὶ ἀξίως τούτους τε καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις συμμάχοις παράδειγμα σαφὲς καταστήσατε. *Thucid. lib. 3.*

3. The good of him that punisheth is aymed at, and this is *proper* to God. Man punisheth not, nor *can*, nor *ought*, for his own good, or the Satisfaction of his own justice; but *God made all things for himselfe, and the wicked for the day evill*, Prov. 16.4. and Rom. 9.22. and in Gods dealing with men, whatever he doth unlesse it be for this end, it is not *properly* punishment. §. 13.

This is τιμωρία, *vindicta noxæ*; purely the recompensing of the evill that is committed, that it may be revenged. This (I say) in Gods dealing is *properly punishment*, the *revenge of the evill done*, that himselfe, or his justice may be satisfyed, as was seen before, from *Rom* 2.7, 8, 9. *verse*. Whatever of evill God doth to any, which is therefore called *punishment*, because it partaketh of the *generall* nature of punishment, and is evill to him that is punished; yet if the intendment of God be not to revenge the evill past upon him, in a proportion of Law, it is not punishment properly so called. And therefore it will not suffice to prove that Believers are, or may be punished for sinne, to heap up Texts of Scripture, where they are said to be *punished*, and that in reference to their sinne; unlesse it can be also proved, that God doth it *animo ulciscendi*, and that their punishment is *vindicta noxæ*, and that it is done τοῦ πονοῦντος ἕνεκα ἵνα ἀποπληροθῇ: but of this I am not now to treat. The Reader may hence see what punishment is in generall; what are the *ends* of it, and its kinds from thence; & what is punishment from God, properly so called. It is *vindicta noxæ, animo ulciscendi, ut ipsi satisfiat*: and this kind of punishment was the death of Christ: which is to be proved.

3. That the death of Christ was a punishment properly so called, which is the third consideration of it, as I said, is next to be proved. Of all the places of Scripture and Testimonys whereby this may be demonstrated, I shall fix only on one portion of Scripture: and that is *Isai.* 53. What in particular shall be produced from thence, will appeare when I have given §. 14.

some generall Considerations of the Chapter, which I shall do at large, as looking on that Portion of Scripture as the sum of what is spoken in the old Testament, concerning the Satisfactory Death of Jesus Christ.

§. 15. 1. This whole Prophesy from, *v.* 13. of *chap.* 52. which is the head of the present Discourse, is evinced to belong to the *Messias*, against the *Jewes*.

1. Because the *Chaldee Paraphraſt*, one of their most ancient Masters, expresly names the *Messias*, and interprets that whole Chapter of him; *behold* (saith he) *my servant the Messias shall deale prudently*. And the Ancient *Rabbins*, as is abundantly proved by others, were of the same mind. Which miserably intangles their present *obdurate* Masters, who would fixe the Prophesy upon any, rather then on the Messias. Seeing evidently, that if it be proved to belong to the *Messias* in *Thesi*, it can be applyed to none other in *Hypothesi*, but *Iesus* of *Nazareth*.

§. 16. 2. Because they are not able to find out, or fixe on any one whatever, to whom the things here spoken of, may be accomodated. They speak indeed of *Ieremiah*, *Iosias*, *a righteous man* in generall, the *whole people of Israel*; of *Messiah Ben Ioseph*, a man of Straw of their own setting up; but it is easy to manifest, were that our present work, that scarce any one Expression in this Prophesy, much lesse *all*, do or can agree to any one, or all of them named, so that it must be brought home to its proper subject: of this at large in the ensuing digression against *Grotius*.

§. 17. 3. That to us it is evident above all contradiction, that the whole belongs to *Iesus* Christ; because not only paticular Testimonies are taken from hence in the *New Testament* and applyed to him, as *Mat.* 8. 17. *Mark.* 15 28. *Luk.* 22. 37. *Rom* 10. 16. but it is also expounded of him in generall for the Conversion of soules, *Act.* 8. 28. The story is knowne of *Philip* and the *Eunuch*.

§. 18. 3. This is such a Prophesy of Christ, as belongs to him not only *properly*, but *immediately*: that is, it doth not in the first place point out any Type of Christ, and by him shaddow out Christ, as it is in sundry Psalmes, where *David* and *Solomon* are *firstly* spoken of, though the *Messias* be principally intended: but here is no such thing. Christ himself is immediately spoken of.

of. *Socinus* sayes indeed, that he *doubted not but that these things did primarily belong to another*, could he be discovered, who he was: and that from Him was the Allusion taken, and the Accommodation made to Christ: and if (saith he) *it could be found out who he was*, much light might be given into many expressions in the Chapter. But this is a *bold figment*, for which there is not the least countenance given either from Scripture or reason; which is evidently decryed from the former Arguments, whereby the impudency of the Jewes is confounded: And shall be farther in the ensuing *digression* where it shall be proved that it is impossible to fix on any *one* but *Jesus Christ*, to whom the severall expressions, and matters expressed in this *Prophesy* may be accommodated.

§. 19. 2. Now there are three *generall parts* of this Prophesy, to consider it with Reference to the businesse in hand: As the seat of this Truth in the old Testament.

1. A description given of Christ, in a *mean, low, miserable condition*, from *v.* 14. of *Chap.* 52. to *v.* 5. of *Chap.* 53. His *visage was marred, and his forme, more then the Sonnes of men, he hath no forme, nor comelinesse* v. 2. *No beauty, a man of griefe, and sorrowes, despised, neglected, acquainted with griefe*, v. 3. looked on *as stricken and afflicted of God.* v. 4.

2. The Reason is given of this Representation of the *Messias*, of whom it is said in the entrance of the Prophesy, that he should deale *prudently, and be exalted, and extolled, and be very high*. To which this description of him seemes most adverse and contrary. The Reason (I say) hereof is given from *v.* 5. to the 10. it was on the account of his being punished, and *broken* for us, and our sinnes.

3. The issue of all this from *v.* 10. to the end, is the Justification and Salvation of Believers.

It is the second that I shall insist upon, to prove the Death of Christ, to have in it the nature of *punishment*, properly and strictly so called.

§. 20. Not to insist upon all the particular passages, that might be done to great advantage, and ought to be done, did I purpose the *through*, and *full* handling of the businesse before me, (but I am *in transitu*, and pressing to somewhat farther) I shall only urge two things.

1. The Expressions throughout, that describe the state and condition of Christ as here proposed.

2. One or two singular Assertions, *comprehensive* of much of the rest.

§. 21. For the the first, let the Reader consider what is contained in the severall words, here setting forth the condition of Christ: we have, *despising* and *rejecting*, *sorrow* and *griefe*, v. 4. He was *stricken, smitten, afflicted*; or there was *striking, smiting, affliction* on him. *Wounded, bruised, chastised with stripes*, v. 5. *wounding, bruising, chastising* unto soreneſſe, *oppressed, stricken, cut off, killed, brought to slaughter*, v 7,8,9. *Bruised, sacrificed*, and his *soule made an offering for sin* v. 10.

Now certainely for the *materiall* part, or the matter of punishment, here it is abundantly: here is *malum passionis* in every kind. *Immission* of evill, *substraction* of Good in soule and body: here is plentifull measure *heaped up, shaken together, and running over.*

§. 22. But it may be said, though here be the *matter* of punishment, yet it may be all this was for some other end; and so it may be it was (παιδεία or δοκιμασία, or παιδυσία,) not τιμωρία, or punishment *properly* so called.

Consider then the ends of punishment before insisted on, and see what of them is applicable to the *Transaction* betweene God and Christ here mentioned.

1. Was it for his *own Correction?* No sayes the Prophet, *v. 9. He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth*: He was perfectly innocent. So that he had no need of any *Chastisement* for his Amendment; and so signally in sundry places, where mention is made of the *Death* of Christ, his own *spotlesse innocency* is often pleaded. Neither was it for his *instruction* that he *might be wise*, and *instructed* in the will of God; for at the very entrance of the Prophesy, Chap. 52. 13. he sayes, he shall deale prudently and be exalted. He was Faithfull before in all things. And though he *experimentally* learned obedience, by his sufferings, yet habitually to the utmost his *eares were bored*, and himselfe prepared to the will of God, before the afflictions here principally intended. Neither

3. Was He παράδειγμα; pnnished for example; to be made en example to others, that they might not *offend*: For what

what can *offenders* learne from the punishment of one who *never offended*: He was *cut off, but not for himselfe*: and the end assigned *v.* 11, 12. which is not the Instruction only, but the justification, and Salvation of others, will not allow this end. *He shall justify many, for he shall beare their iniquities*; He set us an example in his Obedience; but he was not punished for an Example. Neither

4. Was it μαρτυρία, a suffering to beare *witnesse* and Testimony to the Truth. There is no mention of any such end in this place. Yea to make that the maine intendment here, is a monstrous figment. The expressions all along as we shall see in the next place, are, that all this was for our *transgressions*, for our *sinnes*, for our *iniquities*, for our *peace*. God *wounded, bruised, killed him, for our iniquities*; that is, he dyed to beare witnesse to his Doctrine. *Credat Apella.*

2. Then, the matter of punishment being expressed, see the cause of the infliction of it. It was for *Transgressions*, for *iniquities*, v. 5. For *wandring* and *iniquity*, v. 6. For *Transgressions*, *v.* 8. For *sinne*, v. 12. Let us now remember the generall description of punishment that was given at the beginning; It is *Malum passionis quod infligitur ob malum actionis*, and see how directly it suits with this punishment of Jesus Christ. 1. Here is *malum passionis inflicted, wounding, bruising, killing*. And 2. there is *malum actionis deserving, sinne, iniquity*, and *transgression*. How these met on an innocent person, shall be afterwards declared. 2. Goe along to the peculiar description of *punishment* properly so called, as mannaged by God. It is *vindicta noxæ*; now if all other ends and causes whatever, as of *Chastisement* or *Example*, &c. be removed, and this only be *asserted*, then this Affliction of Christ was *vindicta noxæ*, punishment in the most *proper* sence; but that these ends are so removed hath been declared upon the particular consideration of them. §. 23.

And this is the first Argument from this place to prove; that the Death of Christ and his *suffering*, hath the nature of punishment.

2. The second is, from the more particular expressions of it to this purpose, both on the part of the *person punishing*, and on the part of the person *punished*: a single expression on each part may be insisted on. §. 24.

1. On

1. On the part of God punishing, take that of *v.* 6. *The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all:* of which sort also is that of *v.* 10. *Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he put him to grieve, when thou shalt make his soule an offering for sinne.*

2. On the part of *him punished*, v. 11: *He shall bear their iniquities.* From the consideration of these expressions, we shall evidently evince what we have proposed. Of these in the next Chapter.

CHAP. XXIIII.

Some particular Testimonies evincing the Death of Christ to be a punishment, properly so called.

§. 1. THE two Expressions that I chose in *particular* to *consider*, are nextly to be insisted on.

The first relates to *Him*, who did inflict the punishment. The other to him that was punished.

The first in v. 6. *The Lord laid on him the iniquityes of us all.* The person *punishing*, is *Jehovah*, the person punished called *Him*; that is, he who is spoken of throughout the whole Prophesy; the *Messiah Jesus Christ*, as above declared.

For the opening of the words, that the *efficacy* of them to our *purpose* in hand may appeare. Two of them are especially to be considered. 1. What is meant by that which is rendred *laid on Him*, 2. What is meant by *Iniquity*.

§. 2. The first by our *Translation* is rendred in the Margent, *Made to meeet*; He *made to meet*; *on him the iniquities of us all*; The vulgar Latine, *posuit Dominus in eo.* The *Lord put upon him* according to our Translation in the Text. *Montanus, dominus fecit occurrere in eum.* God hath caused to meet on him, according to our Translation in the Margent. *Junius* to the same purpose. *Jehovah fecit ut incurrat*, the Lord made *them meet, & fall on him.* The Septuagint render it, καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν. The Lord *delivered him to our sins*, that is, to be punished for them. By others the *word* is rendered *impegit*, *traduxit*, *conjecit*, all to the same purpose

purpose, importing an act of God in *conveying* our sins to Christ.

The word here used is הפגיע; its Root is פגע to which all §. 3.
the significations mentioned, are assigned; *Occurrere, obviam ire, incurrere, aggredi, rogare, precari*: The first generall signification of it is to *meet*, as the bounds of a Field, or Country, or house, meet with one another. *Iosuah* 15.34. ופגע בגילן So all along in that chapter, where the bounds of one Country are said to reach to another; that is, to meet with them: it is the word here used. So in voluntary Agents, it is *obviam ire*, or to meet, and that either for *good or evill*; for good it is spoken of God, *Psal* 64.5. thou meetest him, &c. and so for evill *Amos* 5.19. *as if a man fled from a Lyon, and a Beare meet him*: ופגעו that is, to *teare him* in pieces. Hence because men that met others, went to them, to desire some help of them, the word also signifies to *aske*, to *pray*, *entreat*, or *intercede*; so the word is used *Isa.* 59.16. there was no *entreater*, מפגיע none to *meet*, to *come* and aske. And in this very chap. v. 12. he made *intercession for the transgressors*; the word is the same with that here used; to meet the *Lord*, and intercede for transgressors, to stay his hand against them, is its sence.

2. To *meet*, *or to make to meet* properly, which is the First, and most cleare sence of the word. It is often used for to meet *animo hostili*, to meet, to *fall* upon for hurt, 1 *Sam.* 22.17. the servants of the King would not put forth the hand לפגע *to meet*, that is, as we have translated it, to *fall upon* the Priests and kill them; so 2 *Sam.* 1.15. *David* bid his young man arise, פגע *fall upon* the *Amalekite*, that is, to kill him. *Judg.* 15.12. *Sampson* made the men of *Judah* sweare that they would not תפגעו *meet with him*, or *fall* on *him* themselves.

Nextly, it may be enquired in what sence the word is here §. 4.
used, whether in the first spoken of, to *aske*, *entreat*, *intercede*; or in the latter, to *meet*; or to *meet with*.

Grotius interpreteth it, (to remove, so much of his interpretation by the way) *permisit Deus, ut ille nostro gravi crimine indignissima pateretur*; that so he might suit what is spoken to *Jeremiah*, without pretence or colour of proofe. For the word, it is 46 times used in the Old Testament, and if in any one of them it may be truly rendred *permisit*, as it is done by him, or to that sence, let it be here so applied also. And for that sence, which

is,

is, that God suffered the Jews by their wickedness to *intreat* him evilly, it is most remote from the intendment of the words, and the Holy Ghost in them.

§. 5. 1. First then, that the words cannot be interpreted to *pray*, or *intercede*, is evident frō the *contexture*; wherein it is said (in *this* sence) *he prayed him for the iniquity of us all*; that is, the Lord prayed Christ for the iniquities of us all. This sence of the word הפגיע in this place, *Socinus* himself grants not to be proper, nor consistent. *Porro significatio illa, precari, in loco nostro locum habere non potest; alioqui sequeretur Isaiam voluisse dicere, Deum fecisse, ut omnium nostrum iniquitas per Christum, vel pro Christo precata fuerit, quod longe absurdissimum esse nemo non videt. cap. 21. p. 132. Prælec. Socin.*

2. It is then *to meet*: now the word here used being in *Hiphil*, which makes a double Action of that expressed by adding the Cause, by whose Power, vertue, and *impresse*, the thing is done; thence it is here rendred *occurrere fecit*; he made to meet, and so the sence of it is, God *made our sinnes*, as it were, to *set upon*, or to fall upon *Iesus Christ*, which is the most common use of the word, as hath been shewed.

§. 6. It is objected, that the word signifies *to meet*, yet no more but this may be the meaning of them; *God in Christ met with all our iniquities*; that is, for their pardoning, and removall, & taking away

Of the many things that may be given in for the eversion of this *Glosse*, I shall name only two, whereof the first is to the *word*, the latter to the *matter*. For the *word*; the *Conjugation* according to the common Rule, enforces the sence formerly mentioned; *he made to meet*, and not *he met*.

2. The Prophet in *these words* renders a reason of the *contemptible* sad condition of the *Messiah*, at which so many were *scandalized*, and whereupon so few believed the report of the Gospel concerning him; and this is, that *God laid on him our iniquities*; now there is no reason why he should be represented in so *deplorable* a state and condition, if God only *met* with, & *prevented* our sinne, in and by him, which he did (as they say) in his Resurrection, wherein he was exceeding Glorious; so that the meaning of the word is, that God made *our sinnes to meet on him*, by laying them on him; and this sence *Socinus* himself consents unto, *Prælec. cap. 21. p. 133.* But this also will farther appeare

appeare in the explication of the next word: and that is, *our iniquities.*

He hath laid on him the Iniquities of us all. עון How the Iniquity of us, that is, the *punishment* of our iniquity? I shall offer three things, to make good this interpretation.

§. 7. 1. That the *word* is often found in that sence; so that it is no new, or uncouth thing, that here it should be so, *Gen.* 4. 13. עוני *mine iniquity* is greater then I can beare, it is the same *word* here used; they are the words of *Cain*, upon the denunciation of God's judgement on him; and what *iniquity* it is, he gives you an account in the next *words, behold thou hast cast me out*, v. 14. that was only the *punishment* laid on him. It is used in like manner severall times *Levit.* 20. 17, 19. and 1 *Sam.* 28. 10. *Saul* sweare to the *Witch*, that no *iniquity* should befall her; that is, no *punishment* for that which she did at his command, in raising up a Spirit to consult withall, contrary to the Law. And also in sundry other places: so that this is no *new* signification of the word, and is here most proper.

§. 8. 2. It appears from the explication that is given of this thing in many other expressions in the Chapt. *God laid on him the iniquity of us all.* How? in that it pleased him to *bruise him*, and *put him to griefe*, v. 10. In that he *was wounded for our transgressions, and he was bruised for our iniquities*, v. 5. as will be made more evident when I come to the next Phrase: *He bare our iniquities*, which answers to this, *He laid them on him.*

§. 9. 3. Because he did *so lay our sinne on Christ*, that he made his *Soul an offering for sinne*: when our iniquities were on him, his Soul, that is, He, by an usuall *Synecdoche*, (the Soul for the Person) was made אשם an *offering* for sinne; the word here used, is like *piaculum* in Latine, which signifies the *fault*, and him who is *punished* for it in a way of a publick Sacrifice: So is this word taken both for a *sinne*, a *trespasse*, and a *Sacrifice* for the *expiation* of it. As another word, *viz.* חטאת is used also *Lev.* 4. 3. He shall offer it לחטאת for a *sinne*; that is, an *Offering for sinne*; So also *Exod* 29, 14. *Lev.* 4. 29. And this very word is so used *Levit.* 7. 2. They shall kill אשם that is, the *sinne*, or *sin offering*, or *trespasse offering*, as there it is rendred: and other instances might be given. Now God did so cause our iniquities to meet on Christ, that he then *under them* made himselfe אשם

or *an offering for sinne.* Now in the offering for sinne, the penalty of the Offence was, *suo more*, laid on the *beast*, that was Sacrificed or made an offering; *Paul* interpreteth these words by other expressions, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. he made him to be a *sinne for us*, that is, *an offering for sinne*, חטאת. He made him *sinne*, when he made him a *Curse*. the curse of the Law, *Gal:* 3. 13. that is, gave him up to the Punishment, by the Law due to sin: *Rom.* 8. 3. *God sending his own Son in the likenesse of sinfull flesh, and for sinne,* καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας, *for sin*, a Sacrifice for sinne, condemned sin in the flesh, *Heb:* 10. 6. ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας, *in burnt Offerings, & for sin thou hadst no pleasure*; and againe, ὅτι θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας. It appears then from all that hath been said, that our iniquities that were laid on Christ, were the punishment due to our iniquity.

§. 10. Farther to cleare this, I shall a little consider what Act of God this was, whereby he laid our iniquities on Christ; and these two things are considerable therein.

1. How it was *typically* prefigured.

2. How it was done, or in what *Act* of God the doing of it doth consist.

1. This was eminently represented in the great *Anniversary Sacrifice*, of which I have spoken formerly; especially in that part which concernes the *Goate*, on which the *Lot* fell to be sent away: That that Goat was a Sacrifice, is evident from the 5. v. where both the *Kids* of the *Goats*, (afterward said to be two Goats) are said to be a Sinne Offering; how this was dealt withall, see v. 21. *Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the live Goat, & confesse our sin, all the iniquities of all the people, all their transgressions in all their sins. & put them upon the Head of the Goat,* Now in what sence could the sins of the People, be put upon the Head of the Goat.

Συμβολικῶς.

1. This was not meerly a Representation; as it were a Shew or Pageant, to set forth the taking away of iniquity; but Sins were Really, as to that Typicall Institution, laid on the Head of the Goat: whence he became a *piaculum*, an ἀνάθημα; and he that touched him was defiled, so v. 26. The Man that carried out the Goat, was unclean untill he was legally purified, and that because the Sinne of the People was on the Head of the Goat, which he so carried away.

2. The proper *pravity*, *malice*, and *filth* of sinne, could not be laid

laid on the Goat. Neither the Nature of the thing, nor the Subject will beare it; for neither is Sinne, which is a *Privation*, an *irregularity*, an *obliquity*, such a thing, as that it can be translated from one to another, although it hath an Infectious, and a Contagious quality to diffuse it selfe, that is, to beget something of the like nature in others: nor was the Goat a Subject wherein any such pernicious or depraved habit might reside, which belongs only to *Intelligent* Creatures, which have a morall Rule to walk by.

§. 11. 3. It must be the punishment of Sinne, that is here intended, which was in the Type laid on the head of the Goat; And therefore it was sent away into a Land not inhabited, a Land of *separation*, a Wildernesse, there to perish, as all the Jewish Doctors agree: that is, to undergoe the Punishment that was inflicted on him; That in such Sacrifices for sinne, there was a reall imputation of sinne unto punishment, shall afterwards be farther cleared.

וארבמה

§. 12. Unto this Transaction doth the Prophet allude in this expression, he *Laid on*, or *put on him*. As the High Priest confessed all the sins, Iniquities, & Transgressions of the people & laid thē on the Head of the *scape Goat*, which he bare, undergoing the utmost punishment he was capable of, and that punishment, which in the generall kind and nature is the punishment, due to sinne, an *evill and violent death*. So did God lay all the sinnes, all the punishment due to them, really upon one that was *fit*, *able*, and *appointed* to beare it, which he suffered under to the utmost, that the *Justice* of God required on that account. He then tooke a *view* of all our sinnes and iniquityes; He knew what was past and what was to come, knowing all our thoughts a farre off. Not the least errour of our minds, *darknesse* of our understandings, *perversnesse* of our Wills, *Carnallity* of our affections, sinne of our *nature*, or lives, escaped him. All were *γυμνὰ καὶ τετρα χαλισμένα* before him. This is set out by the variety of expressions used in this matter in the Type; all the iniquities, all the transgressions, & all the sinnes And so by every word whereby we expresse sin, in this 53. of *Isaiah*: *going* astray, *turning* aside, *iniquity*, *transgression*, *sinne*, and the like. God (I say) made them all to meet on Christ in the punishment due to them.

§. 13. 2. What is the Act of God, whereby he casts our sins on Christ.

Vide Of the Death of Christ, the price he paid, and the Purchase he made

I have elsewhere considered, how God in this business is to be looked on: I said now in the entrance of this Discourse, that Punishment is an effect of Justice in him, who had power to dispose of the offender as such. To this two things are required.

1. That he have in his hand power to dispose of all the concernments of the offence and sinner, as the *Governour* of Him and them all. This is in God. He is by nature the King and Governour of all the world. Our *Lawgiver*, *Jam.* 4. 12. Having made *rationall Creatures*, and required obedience at their hands, it is *essentially* belonging to him to be their Governour, and not only to have the *soveraigne* dispose all of them, as he hath the supreame dominion over them, with the legall dispose of them, in answer to the *morall subjection* to him, and the obedience he requires of them.

Vid. Diatrib. de Justit. Divin. §. 14.

2. That as he be a King, and have supreame government, so he be a Judge to put in execution his Justice. Thus *God is judge himselfe. Psal.* 50. 6. He is the *Judge of the world. Gen.* 18. 25. *Psal.* 94. 2. *Psal.* 75. 7. *Is.* 33. 22. as in innumerable other places: Now as God is thus the great Governour & Judge, he pursues the constitutive principle of punishment, his own righteous and holy Will, proportioning *penalties* to the demerit of sin.

Thus in the *laying our sinne on Christ*, there was a twofold Act of God: one as a *Governour*, the other as a *Judge* properly.

§. 15. 1. The first is, *innovatio obligationis*, the *innovation of the obligation*, wherein we were detained, and bound over to punishment. Whereas in the *Tenour* of the *Law* as to its *obligation* unto punishment, there was none originally but the name of the Offender, *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt dye*: and *Cursed is every one that continues not*: and *the soule that sinneth it shall dye*; God now puts in the name of the surety of Jesus Christ; that he might become responsible for our sinnes, and undergoe the punishment that we were obliged to. Christ was ὑπὸ νόμον γενόμενος, he was made under the Law; that is, he was put into subjection, to the *Obligation* of it unto punishment: God put his name into the *obligation*, and so the Law came to have its Advantage against him, who otherwise was most free from the charge of it. Then was Christ *made sin*, when by being put into the *Obligation* of the Law, he became lyable to the punishment of it. He was the *Mediatour* of the new Covenant, the *Mediator between God and*

and man, 1 Tim. 2. 5. So a Mediator, as to *lay down his life a ransome* for them, for whō he was a Mediator, *v.* 6. & the *surety* of the Covenant is he also *Heb.* 7. 22. Such a *surety*, as paid that which he never took, made satisfaction for those sins which he never did.

2. The second Act of God as a Judge, is *inflictio pœnæ.* §. 16. Christ being now made obnoxious, and that by his own consent, the Justice of God finding him in the *Law*, layeth the weight of all on him. *He had done no violence, neither was any deceit found in his mouth*; well then, it will be well with him: surely it shall be well with the innocent, no evill shall befall him; nay but said he v. 10 *Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grieve*: Yea, but what was the reason of this? Why was this the will of God? why did this seeme good to the *Just Judge* of all the world? The Reason is in the very next words, *His soule was made an offering for sinne*, which before is expressed, *he bare our griefe, he was wounded for our transgressions*; being made lyable to them he was punished for them.

By that which is said it is evident from this first *expression*, §. 17. or the Assignation of an *Action* to God in reference to him, that this Death of Christ was a *punishment*, He who had power to do it, bringing in him, (on his own voluntary offer) into the *Obligation* to punishment, and *inflicting* punishment on him accordingly.

The second expression whereby the same thing is farther convinced is on the part of him that was *punished*, & this in *v.* 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefes, and carryed our sorrowes*, or which is more evident *v.* 11. *He shall beare their iniquities.*

For the Right understanding of the words, I shall give a §. 18. few briefe *previous* observations, that may give light to the matter we treat of. And the first is,

1. That as this whole thing was done in the *Justice* of God, as hath been declared, so it was done by the *Counsell* and *Appointment* of God. The Apostles confesse the Death of Christ to have proceeded thence, *Act.* 4. 28. and *Act.* 2. 23. Now as laying of our sinnes on Christ, being designed our Mediatour, and undertaking the worke, was an act of God, as the *Governour* of all, and the *righteous* Judge, so this of the *determinate counsell*, and *foreappointment*, or the *eternall designation* of Christ to his *office*, is an Act of *Soveraigne power* and Dominion in God, where-

by he doth as he *pleaseth*, according to the Counsell of his will. As he would make the world in his soveraigne good pleasure, when he might have otherwise done, *Revel.* 4. 11. So he would determine, that Christ should beare our iniquities, when he might otherwise have disposed of it, *Rom.* 11. 34, 35, 36, 37.

§. 19. 2. In respect of us, this *preappointment* of God was an act of Grace, that is, a sovereigne Act of his *good pleasure*, whence all good things, all fruits of Love whatever to us doe flow. Therefore it is called *Love*, Joh. 3. 16. and so in the fruit of it is it expressed, Rom. 8. 32. And on this *John* often insists in his Gospell and Epist: 1 Joh. 4. 9, 10, 11. His aime on his own part was the declaration of his *Righteousnesse*, Rom. 3. 25. and to make way for the praise of his *glorious grace*, Eph. 1. 6. on *our parts*, that we might have all those *good things*, which are the *fruits* of the most intense Love.

§. 20. 3. That Christ himself was *willing* to undergoe this burthen & *undertake* this work: & this as it is consistent with his *death* being a *punishment*, so it is of necessity to make good the other Considerations of it, namely, that it should be a *price, and a Sacrifice*. For no man gives a price, & therein parts with that which is precious to him *unwillingly*; nor is a Sacrifice acceptable that comes not from a *free* & *willing minde*. That he was thus willing himselfe professeth, both in the undertaking & carrying of it on; in the undertaking, *Heb.* 10. 9. *Lo I come to do thy will O God*: It is the Expression of one breaking out with a *ready joy* to do the thing proposed to him. So the Church of old looked on him, as one that came *freely* and *cheerfully*, Cant. 2. 8, 9. *It is the voyce of my beloved, behold he cometh leaping on the mountaines, skipping on the hills: My Beloved is like a Roe, or a young Hart, he standeth behind the wall, he looketh forth at the window, shewing himselfe through the Lattice.* The Church looked on Christ as yet at a distance from the actuall performance of the worke he had undertaken, and so her selfe kept off from that cleare and close Communion which she longed after, and thence shee says of him, that he *stood behind the wall*, that He *looked forth at the window, & shewed himself at the lattices*. There was a *wall* yet hindring the actuall exhibition of Christ; the *fulnes of time was not come*. The purpose of God was not yet to bring forth; but yet in the meane time, Christ

looked

looked on the Church through the window of the promise, and the *Lattice* of the *Levitical* ceremonies.

And what discovery do they make of him, in the view they take in the *broad light* of the *Promises*, and the many glimpses of the *Ceremonial* Types. They see him coming, *leaping on the mountaines, and skipping on the hills*, coming speedily with a great deale of Joy and willingnesse.

So of himselfe he declares what his minde was from of old, from everlasting, *Prov.* 8.30,31. *Rejoycing alwaies before him*, that is, *before God his Father*: but in what did he rejoyce? *in the habitable parts of the earth, & my delight was with the Sons of men.* When this Joy of his was, he tells you *v.* 22,23,26,27. He rejoyced before God his Father in the Sonnes of men, before they were created; that is, in the worke he had to do for them.

His will was also in the *carrying* of it on unto Accomplishment, He must be doing his *Fathers businesse*, his *Will who sent him. Luk.* 12.50. *πῶς συνέχομαι.* He was *pained* as a woman in travaile to be delivered, to come to be baptized in his own blood. And when he was giving himselfe up to the *utmost* of it, He professes his *readinesse* to it *Joh.* 18.11. when *Peter* who once before would have *advised him to spare himselfe*, now being his Counsell was not followed, would have rescued him with his sword: As for his Advice he was called *Satan*, so for his proferd *Assistance*, he is now rebuked: and the reason of it is given, shall *I not drinke of the cup?* It is true, that it might appeare, that his death was not a Price, and a Sacrifice only, but a Punishment also, wherein there was an *immission* of every thing that was evill to the suffering nature, and a *substraction* of that which was Good, He discovered that averseneſſe to the drinking of the Cup, which the Truth of the Humane Nature absolutely required, (and which the amazing bitterneſſe of the Cup overpowred him withall) yet still his will conquered and prevailed in all, *Matth.* 26.53,54. §. 21.

4. Christ his love was also in it, his delight was in the Sonnes of men; his love toward them carryed him out to the worke: And *Paul* proves it by the instance of himselfe, *Gal.* 2.20. *Who loved me.* And *John* applyes the same to all Believers, *Revel.* 1.5,6. *To him that loved us, &c.* And thus was this great worke undertaken. §. 22.

These

These things being premised, let us looke againe to the words under consideration.

§. 23 1. For the Word he *bare* our Griefe *v.* 4. it is נשא; A word of as *large*, and as many *various* Acceptions as any, if not absolutely the most *extensive* in the whole *Hebrew* tongue. It hath usually assigned unto it by the *Lexicographer*, eight or nine severall significations: And to make it evident, that it is of various acceptions, It is used (in the Collections of *Calasius*) 818 times in the *Old Testament*, whereof not a third part is answered in any language by one and the same word. With those sences of it, that are *Metaphoricall*, we have not any thing to doe. That which is the *first*, or most *proper* sence of it & what is most frequently used, is to *carry* or *beare*, & by which it is here translated as in very many other places.

§. 24. *Socinus* would have it here be as much as *abstulit*, he *took away*, so saith he, *God took away our sinne in Christ, when by him he declared, and confirmed the way whereby Pardon and Remission is to be obtained; as he pardoned our sinne in Christ, by discovering the new Covenant, and Mercy therein.* Now because the Word is of such various significations, there is a necessity that it be interpreted by the Circumstances of the place where it is used. And because there is not any circumstance of the place, on the aceount whereof the *word* should be rendred *abstulit*, he *took away*, and not *tulit*, he *took*, *bare*, or *suffered*, we must consider what Arguments or Reasons are scraped together *aliunde* by them, and then evince what is the Proper signification of it, in this place.

§. 25. 1. This very expression is used of God *Exod.* 34. 7. נשא עון *ferens iniquitatem*, as also 'tis again repeated, *Numb.* 14. 18. In both which places, we translate it forgiving, *forgiving iniquities, transgressions, and sinnes.* Nor can it be properly spoken of God, to *beare:* for God cannot *beare*, as the word properly signifies.

The summe of the Objection is; The word that is used so many times, and so often *metaphorically*, is once or twice in another place used for to *take away*, or to *pardon*; therefore *this must be the sence of it in this place.* God cannot be said to *beare iniquities*, but only *metaphorically*, & so he is *often* said to *beare*, to be *pressed*, to be *weary*, & *made to serve* with them; He is said to beare our sins, in reference

reference to the end of *bearing* any thing, which is to carry it away: God in Christ *taking away*, *pardoning* our sinnes, is said to Beare them, because that is the way which sinnes are *taken* away; they are taken up, carried, and laid aside. But *he* of whom these words are spoken here, did *beare properly*, and could do so, as shall be shewed.

2. The Interpretation of this place by *Mathew*, or the application of it is insisted on: which is of more importance, *Math.* 8.16,17. Christ curing the diseases of many, and bodily sicknesses, is said to *beare our Griefes*, according as it is said in *Isaiah*, that he should do. Now he did not bear our diseases, by *taking them upon himself*, and so becoming diseased, but *morally*, in that by his Power he took them away from them, in whom they were. §. 26.

Not to make many *Words*, nor to multiply Interpretations, and Accommodations of these places, which may be seen in *them*, who have to good purpose made it their business to consider the *paralell places* of the Old and New Testaments, and to Reconcile them: I say only, it is no New thing to have the Effect and *Evidence*, and end of a thing, spoken of in the New Testament, in Answer to the Cause, and Rise of it, mentioned in the Old, by the application of the same *words* unto it which they are mentioned in. For instance, *Paul Eph.* 4.8. citing that of the *Psalmist*, *Psal.* 68.18. Thou hast *ascended up on high, and hast led Captivity Captive, and received gifts for men*; renders it; when he ascended up on high, he *led Captivity Captive, and gave gifts unto Men*; and that because his *giving of them*, was the *end* of his *receiving* of them; and his *receiving* of them, the Foundation of his *giving* of them: the Effect and Fruit being here expressed, the Foundation and Ground supposed.

So also, *Mine eares hast thou bored*, *Psal.* 40. is rendred, *a body hast thou prepared me*, *Heb:* 10. because the end of the *boring the eare* of Christ was, that he might *offer his body a Sacrifice* to God; So it is here in this place of *Mathew*: Christ his taking away the bodily Distempers, and Sicknesses of men, was an Effect, and an Evidence of his *taking away their sinne*, which was done by *bearing* of them; And therefore *Mathew* mentioning the Effect and Evidence of the thing, doth it in the Words that expresse the

Cause and Foundation of it. Not, that, that was a compleat Accomplishment of what was foretold, but that it was so demonstrated in the Effect and evidence of it. Nor do the *Socinians* themselves think that this was a full accomplishment of what is spoken by the Prophet, themselves insisting on another interpretation of the words: So that notwithstanding these exceptions, the Word here may have its Proper signification of *bearing* or *carrying*; which also that it hath, may be farther evidenced.

§. 27. 1. Here is no cogent Reason, why the *Metaphoricall* use of the Word should be understood. When it is spoken of *God*, there is a Necessity, that it should be interpreted by the Effect; because Properly he cannot *beare*, nor *undergoe griefe*, *sorrow*, or punishment. But as to the *Mediator*, the case is otherwise, For he *confessedly* underwent these things Properly, wherein we say that this word *Bearing* of Punishment doth consist; He was *so bruised, so broken, so slaine*: So that there is no Reason to depart from the Propriety of the Word.

§. 28. 2. Those who would have the sence of the Word to be, to *take away*, in this place, confesse it is by way of the *Allusion* before mentioned, that he that *takes away* a thing, *takes it up*, and *bears* it on his shoulders, or in his armes, untill he lay it downe; and by vertue of this Allusion doth it signify to *take away*. But why! seeing that *taking up*, and *bearing*, in this place is proper, as hath been shewed, why must that be *leaped* over, and that which is Improper, and spoken by way of Allusion, be insisted on.

§. 29. 3. It appears that this is the Sence of the word, from all the circumstances of the Text, and Context. Take three that are most considerable.

1. The *Subject* spoken of, who did thus *bear our Griefes*; and this is Christ; of whom such things are affirmed, in Answer to this Question, *How did he bear our Griefes?* as will admit of no other sence: The Holy Ghost tells us how he did it, 1 *Pet.* 2. 24, 25. *Who his own selfe bare our sinnes in his body on the Tree.* That *Peter* in that place expressed this part of the Prophesy of *Isaiah*, which we insist upon, is evident: The Phrase at the close of v. 24. and the beginning of v. 25. of this Chapter make it so. They are the very words of the end of the 5 & beginning of the 6th verses

verses here; How then did Christ *beare our Griefes*? Why in that he *bare our sinne in his own body on the Tree.*

I shall not insist on the precise signification of the word ἀναφέρω, here used, as though it expressed the *outward manner* of that suffering of Christ for sinne, when he was *lifted* up on the *Crosse* or *Tree.* It is enough, that our *sinnes* were *on him, his body*; that is, his whole *humane Nature*, (by an usuall *Synecdoche*) when he was on the Tree; that he did it when he *suffered in the flesh*, Cap. 4. 1. He that did so *bear our Griefe*, sinne, and iniquities, as to have them in his *own body*, when he suffered in the flesh, he is said properly therein *tulisse*, not *abstulisse*, to have *borne*, not *taken away* our Griefes. But that this is the Case, in Christ his *bearing* our *Griefe*, the Holy Ghost doth thus manifest.

2. The *manner* how Christ *bare* them evidently manifesteth, in what sence this *expression* is to be understood. He so *bare them*, that in doing so, he was *wounded* and *bruised*, *grieved*, *chastised*, *slain*, as it is at large expressed in the Context. Christ *bare* our Griefe, so as in doing of it, to be *wounded*, *broken*, *grieved*, *killed*, which is not to *take them* away, but really to *beare* them upon himselfe. §. 30.

3 The *Cause* of this *bearing our Griefe*, is assigned to be *Sinne*; He was *wounded for our transgressions*, as was shewn before: Now this cannot be the sence, *for our sinnes, he took them away*; but for our sinnes, *He bare the punishment* due to them, 2 *Cor* 5. 21. §. 31.

4. To put all out of Question, the Holy Ghost in this Chapter useth another *word* in the same *matter*, with this, that will admit of no other Sence, then that which is proper. And that is סבל v. 11. יסבל הוא עונתם *He shall beare their iniquities*: and it is used immediately after this we have insisted on, as explicative of it; and *carried our sorrowes*: Now as נשא properly signifies to *lift*, to *take up* that which a man may *carry*, so סבל signifies to *beare*, and *undergoe* the burthen, that is taken or that a man hath *laid* on his shoulders. And *Matthew* hath rendred this word by βαστάζω, τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν, that is *bajulo, porto*: to *beare* a thing, as a man doth a *burthen* on his shoulders: nor is it ever used in the Scriptures, but it is either properly *to beare a burthen*, or *Metaphorically* from thence, to undergoe that which is *heavy* and burthensome: Thus did Christ *bare* our Griefes, our Iniquities, by putting his shoulder under them, taking them on *himself*.

§. 32. 2. What did he thus beare? our *Griefes*, our *Sinnes*; or our *Iniquities*, our sinnes. Let us see by a second instance, what it is in the Language of God, *To bear iniquities*, and this Argument will be at an issue. *Lament.* 5.7. *Our Fathers have sinned, and are not, and we have borne their iniquities. We have borne their Iniquities*, or the punishment that was due to them; *They are not*, they are gone out of the World, before the day of Recompence came, and we lye under the punishment threatned and inflicted for their sinnes, and our own. Distinctly,

§. 33. 1. Men are said to *bear their own sinne*, *Levit.* 19. 5. *every one that eateth it shall bear his iniquity*; that is, he shall be esteemed guilty, and be punished: *Levit.* 20. 17 *He shall bear his iniquity*, is the same with *he shall be killed*, v. 16. and he shall be *cut off from his people*, v. 18. *For a man to bear his iniquity, is constantly* for him to answer the Guilt, and undergoe the Punishment due to it.

2. So also of the sinnes of others, *Numb.* 14. 33. *And your Children shall wander in the Wildernesse forty years, and shall bear your whoredomes*: *beare your whordomes*; that is, my *anger for them*, and the punishment due to them. *Numb.* 30. 15. He that compells by his Power and Authority another to *breake a vow*, shall himselfe be lyable to the *Punishment* due to such a breach of Vow. *Ezek.* 18. 20. is an explanation of all these places: *The soul that sinnes it shall dye*, it shall be punished, *The Son shall not beare the iniquity of the Father, &c.* The Son shall not be punished for the sin of the Father: nor the Father for the sinne of the Son. In briefe, this expression, *To bear iniquities*, is never otherwise used in Scripture, but only for to undergoe the Punishment due thereunto.

§. 34. Thus much then we have clearely evinced. God did *so lay our sinnes* on Christ, as that he *bare* and *underwent* that which was due to them; God inflicting it on him, & he *willingly* undergoing it. Which is my second demonstration from this place, that the Death of Christ is also a *punishment*. Which is all that I shall urge to that purpose. And this is that, and all that we intend by the *Satisfaction* of Christ.

But now having laid so great *stresse* as to our Doctrine under demonstration upon this place of the *Prophet*, and finding some attempting to take away our foundation, before I proceed, I shal *divert* to the *consideration* of the *Annotations* of *Grotius* on this *whole*

Chap.

chap & rescue it from his force & violence, used in contending to make what is here spoken to suit the *Prophet Jeremiah*, and to intend him in the first place: to establish which vain conjecture, he hath perverted the sence of the *whole*, and of every particular *verse*, from the *beginning* to the *end* of this Prophesy.

CHAP. XXV.

A Digression concerning the 53d Chapter of Isaiah: *And the vindication of it from the perverse Interpretation of* HUGO GROTIUS.

§. 1. THis Chapter is well by some termed *Carnificina Rabbinorum*; a place of Scripture that sets them on the *rack*, and makes thē turn thēselves all ways possible to escape the torture, which it puts their unbelieving hearts unto. Not long since a worthy and very *learned friend* told me, that speaking with *Manasseh Ben Israel* at *Amstelredam*, and urging this *Prophesy* unto him, he ingenuously told him, *profectò locus iste magnum scandalum dedit*; to whom the other replyed; *Recte, quia Christus vobis lapis scandali est.* *Hulsius* the Hebrew Professor at *Breda*, professes that some Jewes told him, that their *Rabbins* could easily have extricated themselves from all other places of the Prophets, if *Isaiah* in this place had but held his peace. [a] *Hulsius Theolog. Judaic. lib. 1. Part. 2. Dict. Sapp. de Tempor. Messiæ.* Though I value not their *boasting* of their extricating themselves from the other Prophesies, knowing that they are no lesse entangled with that of *Daniel*, *chap. 9.* (Of which there is an eminent story in *Franzius*, *de sacrificiis*, concerning his dispute with a *Learned Jew* on that subject:) yet it appeares, that by *this*, they are confessedly intricated beyond all hope of evading, untill they divest themselves of their *Cursed Hypothesis*.

[a] *Aliqui Judæi mihi confessi sunt, Rabbinos suos ex Prophetticis Scripturis facile se extricare potuisse, modo Isaias tacuisset.*

Disput. decima, de Sacrificiorum duratione, Thes. 82, 83, 84. &c.

§. 2. Hence it is that with so much greedines they scraped together all the Copyes of *Abrabaniel*'s Comment on this Chapter; so that it was very hard for a Christian, a long time to get a sight of it; as *Constantine l'Empereur* acquaints us in his *Preface*

to his refutation of it: because they thought themselves in some measure instructed by him, to avoid the Arguments of the Christians from hence, by his application of the whole to *Josiah*: and I must needs say he hath put as good, yea a farre better colour of *probability* upon his *Interpretation*, then he with whom I have to do, hath done on his.

Abrabiniel tam avide a Judæis passim conquiritur, ut vix tandem ejus compos fieri potuerim. Nam eum Christiani superiorem putant: qui solide eorum argumenta &c. Constant. l' Emper. Prolog. ad Lectorem: præfix. Com. Abræb. in cap. 53. Is.

§. 3. How *ungratefull* then, & how unacceptable to all Professours of the name of Jesus Christ, must the labours of *Grotius* needs be; who hath to the uttermost of his power reached out his hand to relieve the poore blind Creatures from their rack and Torture, by applying (though successelesly) this whole Prophesy of *Jeremiah*, casting himselfe into the same entanglements with them, not yielding them indeed the least relief, is easily to conjecture. And this is not a litle *aggravated*, in that the *Socinians* who are no lesse racked & tortured with this Scripture then the *Iewes*, durst never yet attempt to accommodate the things here spoken of to any other; though they have expressed a desire of so doing; and which if they could compasse, they would free themselves from the *sharpest sword*, that lyes at the throat of their cause; Seeing if it is certaine, that the things here mentioned may be applyed to any other, the satisfaction of Christ cannot from them be confirmed. This Digression then is to cast into the fire that *broken Crutch*, which this Learned man hath lent unto the *Iewes* and *Socinians* to lean upon, and keep themselves from sinking under their unbeliefe.

§. 4. To discover the rise of that *Learned Mans* opinion, that *Ieremiah* is intended in this Prophesy, the conceits of the *Iewish Doctors* may a little be considered, who are divided amongst themselves; The ancient Doctours generally conclude, that it is the *Messiah*, who is here intended *Behold my servant the Messiah shall prosper*, sayes the *Chaldee Paraphrast* upon the place And *Constentius* l' *Emperour* tells from * *R. Simeon*, in his book *Salkout*, that the Ancient *Rabbins*, in their ancient Book *Tancluma*, and higher, were of the

* *Porro libri istius, unde hæc sectio in Esaiam desumpta est, Author perhibetur D.* Simeon, *concionatorum princeps, qui* Francofurti *olim degebat. Hic e Judæorum vetustissimis Scriptis, secundum bibliorum seriem, dicta & explicationes plurimas magna diligentia & labore collegit: unde libro suo nomen* תנחומא *ac si peram dicas: quia ut in pera reconduntur plurima:* l' Emper.

same

same Judgement. *Rabbi Moses Alschech* is urged to the same purpose at large by *Hulsius*. And in his comment on this place he sayes expressly, *Ecce Doctores nostri laudatæ memoriæ uno ore statuunt, & a majoribus acceperunt, de rege Messia sermonem esse, & doctorum L. M. vestigiis insistemus.* And one passage in him is very admirable in the same place saith he; *Dicunt Doctores nostri L. M. omnium afflictionum quæ mundum ingressæ sunt; tertia pars Daviæ & Patriarchis obtigit: tertia altera seculo excisionis, ultima tertia pars regi Messiæ incumbet* Where he urgeth the common consent of their Doctors for the sufferings of the *Messiah*. Of the same mind was *R. Solomon*, as he is cited by *Petrus Galatinus lib 8. cap 14.* As the same is affirmed by the *Midrach Rush cap 2. 14.* And in *Bereshith Rabba* on *Gen. 24.* as is observed by *Raimundus Martin. Pug. fidei 3ª p. Dist. 1. cap. 10.* So that before these men grew impudent and crafty in corrupting and perverting the Testimonies of the Old Testament, concerning the *Messiah*, they generally granted *him*, and *only* him to be here intended. It was not for want of company then that *Grotius* tooke in with the *Modern Rabbins*, who being mad with envy and malice care not what they say, so they may oppose *Jesus Christ*.

2. Many of the following Jewish Doctors interpret this place of the whole people of the Jewes. And this way goe the men, who are of the greatest note amongst them in these latter daies; as *R. D. Kimchi, Aben Ezra, Abarbiniel, Lipman*, with what weake and mean pretences, with what inconsistency as to the words of the text hath been by others manifested. §. 5.

3. *Abrabinel* or *Abrabaniel*, a man of great note and honour amongst them, though he assent to the former Exposition of applying the whole Prophesy to the *People* of the *Jewes*, and interprets the words at large accordingly, which exposition is confuted by *Constantine l' Empereur*, yet he inclines to a singular opinion of his own, that *Josiah* is the man pointed at, and described: But he is the first and last, that abides by that interpretation.

4. *Grotius* interprets the words of *Jeremiah* in the first place; not denying them (as we shall see) to have an Accommodation to Christ. In this he hath the Company of one *Rabbi*; *R. Saadias Gaon*, mentioned by *Aben Ezra* upon the 52. Chapt. of this *Prophesy v. 13.* But this fancy of *Saadias* is fully confuted by

by *Abarbinel*: which words because they sufficiently evert the whole design of *Grotius* also, I shall transcribe as they lye in the translation of *Hulsius*. *Revera ne unum quidem versiculum video, qui de Jeremiah exponi possit: qua ratione de eo dicetur, Extolletur & altus erit valde? Item illud, Propter eum obdent Reges os suum, Nam ætas illa Prophetas habere consueverat. Quomodo etiam dici potest Morbos nostros portasse, & dolores nostros bajulasse, & in tumice ejus curationem nobis esse, Deum in ipsum incurrere fecisse peccata omnium nostrùm: quasi ipsi pœna incubuisset, & Israel fuisset immunis. Jam illud, Propter peccatum populi mei plaga ipsis, item, Dedit cum improbis sepulcrum ejus, ad ipsum referri nequit; multo minus illud, videbit semen, prolongabit dies, item, Cum robustis partietur spolium. In quibus omnibus nihil est quod de ipso commode affirmari possit. Unde vehementer miror, quomodo* R. Hagaon *in hanc sententiam perduci potuerit, & Sapientes dari qui hanc expositionem laudant: cum tamen tota ista exponendi ratio plane aliena sit, & e Scriptura non facta.*

Now certainely if this *Jew* thought he had sufficient cause to admire, that any blind *Rabbi* should thus wrest the sence of the Holy Ghost, and that any wise man should be so foolish as to commend it: We cannot but be excused, in admiring that any man professing himselfe a Christian, should insist in his steps, and that any should commend him for so doing.

That therefore, which here is affirmed, in the entrance of his Discourse by *Abarbinel*, namely, that not one verse can, or may be expounded of *Jeremiah*, shall now particularly be made good against *Grotius*.

§. 6. 1. He confesseth with us that the *Head* of this Prophesy and Discourse is in *vers.* 13. *chap.* 52. The words of that verse are.

Behold my Servant shall deale prudently: he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.

Of the sence of which words, thus he.

Ecce intelliget servus meus] *Hæc omnia clarissime revelata cognoscet Ieremiah. Exaltabitur & elevabitur & sublimis erit valde.*] *In magno honore erit apud ipsos Chaldæos*, Ierem. 39. ch. v. 40. *My servant Jeremiah shall have all these things clearely revealed to him, and he shall be in great honour with the Chaldeans.* So he,

§. 7. First, for the words themselves: ישכיל with the vulgar Latine, he renders *intelliget*, shall *understand*. The word signifies rather

rather *prudence* for Action with successe, then any speculative knowledge by Revelation: 1 *Sam.* 18. 30. it is used of *David* behaving himselfe *wisely* in the businesse of his *millitary* & civill employment. Its opposite saith *Pagnin*, is טבל (*quod incogitantiam significat in rebus agendis & ignavã levitatem*) which signifies *incogitancy in the management of affaires and idle lightnesse*: Whence the word is usually taken for to *prosper* in affaires, as it used of our Saviour *Ierem.* 23. 5. *a King shall raigne* והשכיל and *prosper*. Nor can it be otherwise used here, considering the Connexion of the words wherein it stands: it being the precedent to *his* being *highly exalted* who is spoken of; which rather followes his *dealing prudently*, then his *receiving revelations*: So that in the very entrance there is a mistake in the sence of the word, and that mistake lyes at the bottome of the whole Interpretation.

2. I deny that God speaks any where in the Scripture of any *one*, besides Jesus Christ in this phrase, without any addition, *My Servant*, as here; *Behold my Servant*. So he speakes of Christ, Ch. 42. v. 1, 19. and other places; but not of any other Person whatever. It is an expression κατ' ἐξοχὴν, and not to be applyed to any, but to him, who was the *Great Servant* of the Father, in the Work of Mediation. §. 8.

3. Even in respect of *Revelations*, there is no ground, why those made to *Jeremiah*, should be spoken of so Emphatically, and by way of Eminence above others; seeing he came short of the *Prophet*, by whom these words are written. Nor can any instance be given of such a prediction used concerning any Prophet whatever, that was to be raised up in the Church of the Jewes; but of Christ himselfe only.

4. The Exposition of the close of these words, *he shall be* * *exalted and extolled, and be very high*: (the great Exaltation of the Lord Jesus Christ in his Kingdome, when he was made a Prince, and a Saviour, in a most eminent manner, being set forth in various expressions, no one reaching to the glory of it) is unworthy the *Learned Annotator*. *He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high*; that is, the *Chaldeans* shall give him *victualls*: and a *reward*, *Jerem.* 40. 5. and after a while, He shall be carried a Prisoner into *Egypt*, and there knockt on the head: such was the exaltation of the poore Prophet. What resemblance hath §. 9.

Eminentiæ notionem quavis formula expressit, quia illius eminentia erit sublimis excellentia. D. Kimchi.

all this, to the Exaltation of Jesus Christ, whom the *Learned* man confesseth to be intended in these words.

The sence then of these words is, *Jesus Christ the Messiah, the Servant of the Father, Isa.* 42.1,19. *Phil.* 2.7,8. *shall deale prudently,* and prosper in the businesse of *doing* his Fathers will, and carrying on the affaires of his own Kingdome, *Isa* 9.7. *And be exalted farre above all Principalities and Powers, having a name given him above every name, that at the name of Jesus,* &c. *Phil.* 2.7,8.

The next verse is.

§. 10. *As many were astonied at thee, his visage was so marred, more then any man, and his forme more then the Sonnes of men.*

Of the Accomplishment of this, in and upon the Lord Jesus Christ, there is no difficulty. The Astonishment mentioned is that of Men, at his low, and despicable Condition as to outward appearance; which was such, as that he said of himselfe, *he was a worme and no man, Ps* 22. His Condition was such, & his Visage such, as all that knew any thing of him, were astonied to the purpose The *marring of his visage* and forme, as it may point out all the Acts of violence, that were done upon his face, by *spitting, buffeting,* and the like; so they expresse his whole despised, contemned, persecuted estate, and condition. But let us attend to our *Annotator.*

§. 11. *Modo secunda, modo tertia personâ de Jeremia loquitur, quod frequens Hebræis: Sicut multi mirati erant hominem tam egregium tam fædè tractari, in carcerem detrudi, deinde in lacum lutosum, ibiq; & pædore & cibi inopiâ tabescere: Sic contra, rebus mutatis, admirationi erit honos ipsi habitus.* "He speaks of *Jeremiah*, sometimes in the second, "sometimes in the third Person, which is frequent with the "Hebrews: As many wondered that so excellent a person "should so vilely be dealt with, be thrust into Prison, and "then into a miry lake, and there to pine with stinke, and "want of food: So on the contrary, affaires being changed, "the Honour afforded him, shall be matter of admiration.

§. 12. 1. To grant the first observation, as to the change of Persons in the discourse, the word (שמם *shall be astonied*) here used, signifies not every *slight* Admiration, by wondering upon any occasion, or that may be a little more then ordinary: but mostly, an *Astonishment* arising from the contemplation of some *ruthfull* spectacle. So *Levit.* 26.32. *I will bring the Land into desolation*

lation, and the Enemies which dwell therein, shall be astonied at it; and the word is neer twenty times used to the same purpose. This by way of diminution is made, *mirati sunt, admirationi erit*.

2. This Astonishment of men, is by *Grotius* referred both to the *dejection*, and *Exaltation* of *Ieremiah*, whereof there is nothing in the words. It is the Amazement of men, at the *despicable condition* of him, that is spoken of, only, that is intended; but without intruding something of his *Exaltation*, this discourse had wanted all *colour* or pretext. §. 13.

3. Was it so great a matter in *Ierusalem*, that a Prophet should be put in Prison, there, where they *imprisoned, stoned, tortured*, and slew them almost all, one after another, in their several Generations, that it should be thus propheseyed of, as a thing that men would, and should be amazed at? Was it any wonder at all in that Citty, whose streets not long before, had runne with the blood of *innocent* men, that a Prophet, should be cast into *Prison?* Or was this peculiar to *Ieremiah* to be dealt so withall? Is it any matter of Astonishment to this very day? Was his *Honour* afterward, such an *amazing* thing, in that for a little season he was suffered to go at Liberty, and had *victualls* given him? Was not this, as to the thing it selfe, common to him with many Hundred others? Were his afflictions such, as to be beyond *compare* with those of any man, or any of the Sons of men? Or his *Honours* such, as to dazle the eyes of men with Admiration and Astonishment? Let a man dare to make bold with the word of God, and he may make as many *such* Applications as he pleaseth, and find out what Person he *will*, to answer all the Prophecies of the *Messiah*. This not succeeding, let us try the next verse.

So shall he sprinkle many Nations; the Kings shall shut their mouthes at him: for that which had not been told them, shall they see, and that which they had not heard, shall they consider. §. 14.

Ita asperget gentes multas] *in Hebr.* sic asperget; *ut respondeat illi* sicut, *quod præcessit. Multos ex Gentibus ab Idolorum cultu averiet. Similitudo sumpta ab aspersionibus Legalibus; unde & Chaldæis* זוּ *est objurgavi. At* LXX *habent* θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῷ. *non male, nam* mirari *est aspergi fulgore alicujus.* "In the Hebrew "it is, *So* he shall sprinkle, that it might answer to the, *As*, that "went before. He shall turne many of the Nations from the

"worship of Idols. A similitude taken from the Legall wash-"ings: whence נזה with the Chaldees is to *rebuke*. The LXX "render it, *So shall many Nations wonder at him*: not bad-"ly. For to wonder is as it were, to be sprinkled with any "ones brightnesse.

For the Exposition of the words.

§. 15. 1. We agree that it is, *So he shall sprinkle*: an ἀπάδωσις, relating to the πρότασις v. 14. *As many were astonied, &c.* The great work of Christ, and his exaltation therein, being rendred in opposition to his Humiliation, and Dejection before mentioned: As he was in so meane a condition, that men were *astonied* at him, so he shall be exalted, in his great work of converting the Nations, to their Admiration.

§. 16. 2. It is granted, that the Expression, *he shall sprinkle*, is an Allusion to the *legall washings*, and purifications, which as they were *typicall* of reall Sanctification, and Holinesse; so from them is the *Promise* thereof so often expressed in the termes of *washing* and *cleansing*, *Ezek.* 36. 26, 27. the Terme being preserved and used in the New Testament frequently; the Blood of Christ, whereby this work is done, being therefore called the *Blood of sprinkling*: *Eph.* 5. 25, 26. *Heb.* 9. 14. The *pouring* out of the *Spirit* by Jesus Christ, for the *purifying*, and *sanctifying* of many Nations, not the *Iews* only, but the *Children of God throughout the World*, by Faith in his Blood, is that which is here intended. What the use of נזה in the *Chaldee* to this purpose, is, I know not.

§. 17. 3. The LXX have *very badly* rendred the words, *Many Nations shall wonder at him*; both as to words & sence. For 1. as the words will not beare it; so 2 they make that the *Action* of the Nations towards Christ, which is *his* towards thē; They loose the whole sence of the words, & what they say, falls in with what followes, & is cleerly expressed. 3. It is not helped by the Explanation given to it, by the *Annotator*. The First expression is *Metaphorical*, which the LXX render by a word *proper*, remote from the sence intended; which the *Annotator* explaines by another *metaphor*. By which kind of proceedure, men may lead words and senses whither and which way they please.

§. 18. 4. For the Accommodation of the words to *Ieremiah*; how did he *sprinkle many Nations*; so as to answer the *type* of *Legall* cleansing

cleansing? Did he poure out the *Spirit* upon them? Did he *sanctifie*, and make them holy? Did he *purge* them from their iniquities? Do he turned *many amongst the Nations, from the worship of Idols*. But who told *Grotius* so? Where is it written or recorded? He prophesyed indeed of the *desolation* of *Idolls* and *Idolaters*: Of the *Conversion* of many; of any among the Heathen by his Preaching, he being not purposely sent to them, what evidence have we? If a man may faine *what* he please, and affixe it to *whom* he please, he may make whom he will to be foretold in any Prophesy.

Kings shall shut their mouth at him.] *Reges, ut Nebuchodonosor Chaldæorum, & Nechos Ægyptiorum, eorumq; Satrapæ admirabuntur cum silentio, ubi viderint omnia, quæ dixit Ieremias ad amussim & suis temporibus impleta.* "Kings, as *Nebuchodonosor* of the *Chaldees*, & *Necho* "of the *Ægyptians*, and their Princes, shall admire with silence, "when they shall see all things foretold by *Ieremiah* come to "passe exactly, and to be fulfilled in their own time. §. 19.

That by this Expression, Wonder and Amazement is intended, is agreed. As *men*, all sorts of *men* before were *astonied* at his low condition; so even the *greatest* of them shall be Astonied at the prosperity of his worke and Exaltation. The Reason of this their *shutting their mouthes* in *silence* and Admiration, is, from the work which he shall doe; that is, *he shall sprinkle many Nations*: as is evident from the following reason assigned: *for that which hath not been told them, shall they see*; which expresseth the Meanes whereby he should *sprinkle many Nations*, even by the Preaching of the Gospell to their Conversion.

For the Application hereof to *Ieremiah*. 1. That the Kings mentioned did so *become silent* with Admiration at *him* and Astonishment, is ἄγαγον: and all these magnificent thoughts of the *Chaldeans* dealing with *Ieremiah*, is built only on this; that looking on him, as a man that had disswaded the *Jews* from their Rebellion against them, and rebuked all their wickednesse, and *foretold* their ruine, they gave him his *Life*, and Liberty. 2. The Reason assigned by *Grotius*, why they should so admire him, is for his predictions: but the Reason of the great Amazement and Astonishment at *him*, in the Text, is his *sprinkling of many Nations*: so that *nothing*, not a *word*, or *expression* doth here agree to §. 20.

him. Yea this *Glosse* is directly contrary to the letter of the Text.

The close of these words is; *That which had not been told them shall they see, and that which they had not heard, shall they consider.* Of which he sayes; *They shall see that come to passe, foreseen and foretold by him, which they had not heard of by their Astrologers or Magitians.*

§. 21. 1. But what is it, that is here intended? The desolation of *Jerusalem*: That was it which *Jeremiah* foretold; upon the account whereof he had that respect with the *Chaldees*, which through the mercy of God he obtained. Is this that which is thus *emphatically* expresst; *That which they had not heard, that which they had not been told, this they should see, this they should consider.* That this is directly spoken of Jesus Christ, that he is the *thing* which they had not seen, or heard of, the Apostle tells us, *Rom.* 15.21. Strange that this should be the desolation of *Jerusalem.* 2. It is probable that the Magicians and Astrologers, whose life and trade it was to flatter their Kings with hope of successe in their Warres, and *undertaking*, had foretold the taking of Jeru-
Ezek. 21.21, 22. salem, considering that the King of the *Chaldees*, had used all manner of *divinations*, before he undertook the warre against it. It is too much trouble to abide on such vain imaginations. Nor doth *Grotius* take any care to evidence, how that which he delivers as the sence of the words, may so much as be typically spoken of Jesus Christ, or be any way *accommodated* to him.

§. 22. The Prophet proceeds Chap. 53. with the same continued discourse. *Who hath believed our report; and to whom is the Arme of the Lord revealed?* which words are thus illustrated by the Annotator.

Vultis scire, inquit, quis ille sit futurus de quo cæpi agere, qui & meis prophetiis plenam habebit fidem, & ipse de maximis rebus, quas potentia Dei peraget, revelationes accipiet exactissimas, omnibus circumstantiis additis: Dabo vobis geminas ejus notas, unde cognosci possit: Hæ notæ in Ieremiam quidem congruunt prius, sed potius in Christum. "Will you "know, saith he, who he shall be, of whom I have begun to "treat? Who shall both fully believe my Prophecies, and "shall himselfe receive most exact Revelations of the great "things that the Power of God shall bring to passe, all the "circumstances being added; I will give you two notes of him,

"by

"by which he may be known: These notes in the first place a-
"gree to *Jeremiah*; but rather to Christ.

I suppose if we had not the Advantage of receiving quite another Interpretation of these words, from the Holy Ghost himself in the New Testament, yet it would not have been *easy* for any to have swallowed this Glosse, that is as little allyed to the Text, as any thing that can possibly be imagined. The Holy Ghost tells us, that these words are the complaint of the *Prophet*, and the Church of Believers unto God, concerning the *paucity* of them that would believe in Christ, or did so believe, when he was exhibited in the flesh: the power of the Lord with him for our Salvation, being effectually revealed to very few of the Jewes: so *Ioh.* 12. 37, 38. *But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him, that the saying of Isaias the Prophet might be fulfilled,* Lord who hath believed our report, and to whom hath the arme of the Lord been revealed? So *Rom.* 10. 16. *But they have not obeyed the Gospell; for Isaias saith,* Lord, who hath believed our report? §. 23.

2. Let us now a little compare these severall Interpretations: *Who hath believed our report?* Lord how few do believe on Christ, working miracles himself, & preached by the Apostles? *Jeremiah shall believe my Prophecies,* saith *Grotius. To whom is the arme of the Lord revealed?* To how few is the power of God unto salvation made known by the Holy Ghost? *Ieremiah also shall have cleer revelations,* saies *Grotius.* And this is counted *Learnedly* to interpret the Scriptures; and every day are such *Annotations* on the Scripture multiplied. §. 24.

3. It is not then the Prophets *prediction* of what he should do, of *whom* he treats, what *he* should Believe, what *he* should Receive, whereof there is notice given in this verse; but what *others* shall doe in reference to the Preaching of *him*; they shall *not* believe, *Who hath believed?* §. 25.

4. The *Annotator* tells us, these words do agree to Christ chiefly, and *magis κατ' ἀλήθειαν*. This then must be the signification of them, according to his Interpretation, in relation unto Christ: *He shall believe the Prophesies of Isaiah, and receive revelations of his own.* For my part I am rather of the mind of *John* and *Paul*, concerning these words, then of the *Learned Annotator's*. §. 26.

5. There is no mention of describing the person spoken of, by

by *two notes:* but in the first words the Prophet enters upon the description of *Christ*, what he was, what he did, and suffered for us, which he pursues to the end of the Chapter.

§. 28. V. 2. *For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground; he hath no forme nor comelinesse, and when we shall see him, there is no beauty, that we should desire him.*] An entrance is made in these words, into the *account* that the Prophet intends to give, why so few believed in Christ the *Messiah*, when he came, after they had looked for him, and desired him so long, namely his great unsuitablenesse to their Expectation; They looked for a *Person* shining in *Honour* and Glory, raysing a visible *pompous terrene Kingdome*, whereof they should be made partakers. But Christ, when he comes indeed, grows up both in his *humane nature*, and his *Kingdome*, as a *tender plant*, obnoxious to the incursions of Beasts, Winds, and Stormes, and *treading* on of every one; yet preserved by the providence of God, under whose eye, and before whom *he grew* up, he shall prosper; and he shall be as a Root preserved in the dry ground of the *parcht* house of *David*, and poore Family of *Mary* and *Joseph*, every way outwardly contemptible; so that from thence none could look for the Springing of such a *branch of the Lord*. And whereas they expected that he should appeare with a great deale of *outward forme*, Lovelinesse, Beauty, and every thing that should make a Glorious Person desireable, when they come to see him, indeed, in his outward condition, they shall not be able to discover any thing in the World, for which they should *desire* him, own him, or receive him. And therefore after they shall have gone forth upon the report that shall goe of him, to see him, they shall be offended and returne, and say, *Is not this the Carpenters sonne, and are not his Brethren with us?* This sword of the Lord, which lyes at the Heart of the *Jewes* to this day, the *Learned Annotator* labours to ease them of, by accommodating these words to *Ieremiah*; which through the favour of the Reader, I shall no otherwise refute, then by its repetition: For he shall grow up before the Lord as a tender plant; Jeremiah *shall serve God in his Prophetical Office, whilest he is young:* And as a root out of a dry ground: *He shall be borne at* Anathoth, *a poor village.* He hath no forme nor comelinesse: *He shall be heavy and Sad.* And when we see him &c. *He shall not have an amiable countenance.* Who

might

might not these things be spoken of him that was a *Prophet*, if the name of *Anathoth* be left out and some other supplyed in the roome thereof?

The third verse pursues the description of the *Messiah* in respect of his *abject* outward condition, which being of the same import with the former, and it being not my ayme to *comment* on the Text, I shall passe by.

V. 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefes and carryed our sorrowes: Yet we did esteeme him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.*] Having formerly given the sence of these words, and vindicated them from the Exceptions of the *Socinians*, I shall do no more but animadvert upon their accommodation to *Ieremiah* by *Grotius*. Thus then he, §. 29.

Vere languores nostros ipse tulit.] *Ille non talia meritus, mala subiit quæ nos eramus meriti. Hæc omnia ait Iudæos dicturos post captam urbem. He that deserved no such thing underwent the evills that we had deserved. All these things he saith the Iewes shall say after the taking of the City.*

It is of the unworthy dealing of the Iewes with the Prophet in *Ierusalem* during the seige, that he supposes these words are spoken, and spoken by the *Iewes* after the taking of the Citty. The summe is, when he was so *hardly treated*, we *deserved* it, even to be so dealt withall, not *he*, who delivered the word of God.

But 1. The words are, *he bare our griefes, and carryed our sorrowes*: That by our *griefes* & *sorrowes* our *sins*, and the punishment due to them are intended, hath been declared. That the force of the words *bearing and carrying* do evince, that he tooke them upon himselfe, hath also been manifested. That he so tooke them, as that God made them meet upon him in his Justice, hath likewise been proved. That by his *bearing* of them we come to have *peace*, and are freed, shall be farther cleared; as it is expressly mentioned, *v.* 5, 11. Let us now see how this may be accommodated to *Ieremiah*: Did he undergoe the *punishment* due to the sinnes of the Jewes? Or did they *beare* their own sinnes? Did God cause their sinnes to *meet on Him*, then when he *bare* them, or is it not expressly against his Law, that one should *beare* the sinnes of another? Were the Jewes freed? Had they peace by *Ieremiah's* sufferings? Or rather did they not §. 30.

haſten their utter ruine? If this be to *interpret* the Scripture, I know not what it is to corrupt it.

§. 31. 2. There is not the leaſt evidence, that the *Iewes* had any ſuch thoughts, or were at all greatly troubled after the taking of the City by the *Chaldeans*, concerning their dealings with *Jeremiah*; whom they afterwards accuſed to his face, of being a falſe Prophet, and lying to them in the name of the Lord. Neither are theſe words ſuppoſed to be ſpoken by the *Jewes*, but by the *Church* of God.

§. 32. Grot. *Et nos exiſtimavimus eum percuſſum (leproſum v. 6.) vulneratum & a Deo humiliatum] Nos credidimus Jeremiam merito conjectum in carcerem & lacū, Deo illum exoſum habente, ut hoſtem Urbis, Templi, & Pſeudoprophetam. We believed that Ieremiah was deſervedly caſt into the priſon and mire, God hating him as an enemy of the City and Temple, and as a falſe Prophet.* But

1. Theſe words may be thus applyed to any Prophet whatever, that ſuffered *Perſecution* & *martyrdom* from the Jewes, as who of thē did not, the one or the other? For they quickly ſaw their errour and miſtake as to *one*, though at the ſame time they fall upon *another*; as our Saviour upbraideth the *Phariſees*.

Nor

2. Was this any ſuch great matter, that the Jewes ſhould think a *true* Prophet to be a *falſe* Prophet, and therefore deſervedly puniſhed, as in the Law was appointed, that it ſhould thus ſignally be foretold concerning *Ieremiah*. But that the *Sonne of God*, the Sonne and *heire* of the *Vineyard*, ſhould be ſo dealt withall, this is that the Prophet might well bring in the Church thus ſignally complaining of. Of him to this day are the thoughts of the Jewes no other then as here recorded, which they expreſſe by calling him חלוי.

§. 33. The reaſon of the low condition of the *Meſſiah*, which was ſo miſapprehended of the Jewes, is rendred in the next verſe, and their miſtake rectifyed.

But he was wounded for our tranſgreſſions, he was bruiſed for our iniquities, the chaſtiſement of our peace was upon him, and with his ſtripes we are healed.

I ſuppoſe it will not be queſtioned, but that theſe words belong to our *Bleſſed Saviour*, and that Redemption which he wrought for us by his death and blood. Not only the full accompliſh-

compliſhment of the thing it ſelfe, as delivered in the *New* Teſtament, but the quotation of the words themſelves, to that end and purpoſe 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. do undenyably evince it. In what ſence the words are to be underſtood of *him*, we have formerly declared. That in that ſence they are applicable to any other will not be pleaded. That they have any other ſence is yet to be proved. To this, thus the *Annotator.*

§. 34. Grot.

Ipſe autem vulneratus eſt propter iniquitates noſtras] *in Hebræo. At vero ipſe vulneratus eſt (id eſt, male tractatus eſt) crimine noſtro: in nobis culpa fuit, non in ipſo: Sic & quod ſequitur, Attritus eſt per culpam noſtrorum: Iniquiſſima de eo ſenſimus & propterea crudeliter eum tractavimus: id nunc rebus ipſis apparet: Similia dixerant Judæi qui ſe converterunt die Pentecoſtes: & deinceps.*

But he was wounded for our tranſgreſſions] in the Hebrew, *But he was wounded* (that is, *evilly entreated*) *by our fault. The fault was in us, not in him:* And ſo that which followes: *He was bruiſed by our fault: we thought ill of him*, and therefore handled Him *cruelly*: *This now is evident from the things themſelves*: The like things ſaid the *Iewes* who converted themſelves on the day of *Pentecoſt*, and afterwards.

§. 35.

The *Reading* of the words muſt firſt be conſidered, and then their ſence and meaning: For againſt both theſe doth the *Learned Annotator* tranſgreſſe, perverting the former, that he might the more eaſily wreſt the latter. *He was wounded for our ſinnes* [*crimine noſtro*] *by our crime*; that is, it was our fault not his, that he was ſo evilly dealt with. And not to inſiſt on the word, *wounded* or *tormented with pain*, which is ſlightly interpreted by *evil-entreated*, the queſtion is, whether the efficient, or procuring and meritorious cauſe of Chriſts wounding be here expreſſed.

§. 36.

2. The words uſed to expreſſe this cauſe of wounding are *two*, and both Emphaticall: the firſt is מְחֹלָל, he was wounded מִפְּשָׁעֵינוּ, for our *prevarications*, our proud tranſgreſſing of the Law: פָּשַׁע, *eſt rebellare, & exire a voluntate Domini, vel præcepto, ex ſuperbia*: *R. D. in Michæ.* It is properly to *rebell* againſt man or God; Againſt man, 2 *King.* 3. 7. *The King of* Moab פָּשַׁע *hath rebelled againſt me*: and Ch. 8. v. 20. *In his daies* Edom פָּשְׁעָה *rebelled*: as alſo againſt God, *Iſa.* 1. 2. *I have brought up Children, and they* פָּשְׁעוּ *have rebelled againſt mee.* Nor is it uſed in any other ſence in the Scripture, but for *Prevarication* and *Rebel-*

lion with an high hand, and through pride: The other word is עָוֹן; He was bruised מֵעֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ *for our iniquities*; The word signifies, *a declining from the right way*, with perversity and frowardnesse. עוה, *est iniquè vel perversè agere*; propriè *curvum esse*, vel *incurvari*: so that all sorts of sinnes, are here Emphatically and Distinctly expressed, even the greatest Rebellion, and most *perverse*, *crooked* turning aside from the waies of God.

§. 37. 3. Their *Causality*, in reference to the wounding of him here mentioned, is expressed in the Preposition מִן *min*, which properly is *de, ex, à, è, from*, or *for*. Now to put an issue to the *sence* of these words, and thence, in a good measure, to the sence of this place, let the Reader consult the Collections of the use of this Preposition in *Pagnine, Buxtorf, Calasius*, or any other; when he finds it with *sin* as here, and relating to *punishment*, if he find it once to signify any thing but the *meritorious* procuring cause of punishment, the *Learned Annotator* may yet enjoy his interpretation in quietnesse. But if this be so? If this Expression do constantly and perpetually denote the *impulsive procuring* cause of punishment; it was not well done of him, to leave the *preposition* quite out in the first place, and in the next place so to expresse it, as to confine it to signify the *efficient* cause of what is affirmed.

This being then the reading of the words, *He was wounded* or tormented *for our sins:* The sence as relating to Jesus Christ, is manifest. When we thought he was *Justly* for his own sake, as a *Seducer*, and Malefactor, *smitten* of God, he was then under the Punishment due to our Iniquities: was so *tormented* for what we had deserved. This is thus rendred by our *Annotator*. *Jeremiah* was not in the *fault*, who *Prophesyed to us, but we, that he was so evilly dealt with*: *He was bruised for our Iniquities*, that is, *we thought hard of him, and dealt evilly with him*; which may passe with the former.

§. 38. The LXX render these words: αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν: Rightly! to be wounded διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας, is to be wounded *for*, and not *by* sinne, no otherwise then that also signifies the *impulsive cause*. And the *Chaldee Paraphrast*, not able to avoid the cleerenesse of the Expression, denoting the *meritorious* cause of Punishment, and yet not understanding how the *Messiah* should be wounded,

or

or punished, he thus rendred the words: *Et ipse ædificabit domum Sanctuarii nostri, quod violatum est propter peccata nostra & traditum est propter iniquitates nostras.* "He shall build the House of "our Sanctuary, which was violated for our sinnes (that is, as "a punishment of them) and delivered for our iniquities. So he: not being able to offer sufficient *violence* to the *phrase* of expression, nor understanding an Accommodation of the words to *him* spoken of, he leaves the words, with their own *proper* significancy, but turnes their intendment, by an *addition* to them, of his own.

§. 39. Proceed we to the next words, which are exegeticall of these: *He was wounded for our sinnes; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed.* Of these thus the *Annotator*.

Disciplina pacis nostræ super eum] *apud eum, id est, monitis, nobis attulit salutaria, si ea reciperemus.* "He gave us wholsome warnings, if we would have received them.

But 1. there is in this sence of the words, nothing Peculiar to *Ieremiah*; All the rest of the Prophets did so, and were rejected no lesse then he.

§. 40. 2. The words are not, *He gave us good Counsel, if we would have taken it*: But, *The Chastisement of our Peace was upon him.* And what affinity there is between these two Expressions, that the one of them should be used for the Explication of the other, I professe I know not; *Peter* expounds it by, *He bare our sinnes in his own body on the Tree*, 1 Pet. 2. 24.

§. 41. 3. The word rendred by us, *Chastisement*; by the *vulgar Latine* which *Grotius* followes, *disciplina*, is מוסר *Musar*; which as it hath its first signification to *learne*, so it signifies also to *correct*, because Learning is seldome carried on without *correction*; and thence *disciplina* signifies the same. Now what is the *Correction of our Peace*? Was it the Instruction of Christ, not that *he gave*, but that *he had*, that we have our Peace by? The word עליו he renders, *apud eum*, contrary to the known sence of the word; עלה is to *ascend*, to *lift up*, to *make to ascend*; a word of most frequent use; thence is the word used, rendred *super*; intimating that the Chastisement of our Peace was made to *ascend* on him; as *Peter* expresseth the sence of this place; ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον: he *carried up* our sins

on his body on the Tree; they were made to ascend on him. The LXX render the words ἐπ' αὐτὸν; the Vulgar Latine *super eum:* And there is not the least colour for the *Annotators, Apud eum.* Now the *Chastisement of our Peace*, that is, the punishment that was due, that we might have peace, or, whereby we have peace with God, *was upon him*; is (it seems) *He gave us good Counsell and admonition, if we would have followed it.*

§. 42. 4. Here is no word expressing any act of the person spoken of, but his suffering or undergoing punishment. But of this enough.

Grot. Et livore ejus sanati sumus] *Livore ejus*, id est, *ipsius patientia, nos sanati fuissemus*, id est, *liberati ab impendentibus malis, si verbis ipsius, tanta malorum tolerantia confirmatis, habuissemus fidem. Hebræi potentialem modum aliter quàm per indicativum exprimere nequeunt; ideo multa adhibenda attentio ad consequendos sensus.* "With his stripes "we are healed.] with his wound, or sore, or stripe, that is, "by his Patience we might have been healed; that is, freed "from impendent evills, had we believed his words, confir- "med with so great bearing of evills. The Hebrews cannot "expresse the Potentiall mood, but by the Indicative: there- "fore much attention is to be used to find out the sence.

§. 43. I cannot but professe, that setting aside some of the *monstrous* figments of the *Iewish Rabbins*, I never in my whole life met with an Interpretation of Scripture, offering more *palpable* violence to the Words, then this of the *Annotator.* Doubtlesse to *repeate* it, with all Sober men, is sufficient to *confute* it. I shall briefely adde;

1. The Prophet saies, *we are healed*: the Annotator, *we might have been healed, but are not.*

2. The *healing* in the Prophet, is by deliverance from *sinne*, mentioned in the words foregoing: and so interpreted by *Peter*, 1 *Ep.* 2. 24. whereby we have Peace with God, which we *have.* The healing in the *Annotator*, is the deliverance from destruction by the *Chaldeans* which they were not delivered from, but *might* have been.

3. חבורה *Chabura*, in the Prophet, is μώλωψ in *Peter*; but *patience* in the *Annotator.*

4. *By his stripes we are healed*, is in the Annotator, *By hearkning to him we might have been healed*; or delivered from the evills threatned

threatned, *by his stripes*; that is, by hearkning to his Counsell, when he endured evills patiently; *we are healed*, that is, we *might* have been delivered, but *are* not.

5. As to the Reason given of this Interpretation, that the Hebrews have no *Potentiall Mood*, I shall desire to know who compel'd the Learned *Annotator* to suppose himselfe wiser then the Holy Ghost, 1 *Pet.* 2.24. to wrest these words into a *Potentiall* signification, which he expresseth *directly*, *actually*, *Indicatively*. For a *Iew* to have done this out of hatred and enmity to the Crosse of Christ, had been *tolerable*: but for a man professing himselfe a *Christian*, it is somewhat a strange attempt.

6. To close with this verse; we do not esteeme our selves at all beholding to the *Annotator*, for allowing an Accommodation of these words to our blessed Saviour; affirming, that the Jewes, who *converted themselves* (for so it must be expressed, least any should mistake, and think their *Conversion* to have been the work of the Spirit, and Grace of God) on the day of *Pentecost*, used such words, as those that the Jewes are *fained* to use, in reference to *Ieremiah*. It is quite of another businesse that the *Prophet* is speaking; not of the sinne of the Jewes in crucifying Christ, but of *all our sinnes*, for which he was crucifyed; §. 44.

--- *Munera quidem misit, sed misit in hamo.*

V. 6. *All we like sheep are gone astray, we are turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.* §. 45.

Grotius. Erraveramus a *Manassis* temporibus, alii ad alia idola: Et permisit Deus ut ille nostro gravi crimine indigna pateretur. *We have all erred from the dayes of* Manasseh, *some following some Idols, others others: And God permitted that he by our grievous crime should suffer most unworthy things.*

Though the words of this verse are most important, yet having at large before insisted on the latter words of it, I shall be briefe in my Animadversions on the signall depravation of them by the *Learned Annotator*. Therefore.

1. Why is this Confession of sinnes restrained to the times of *Manasseh*? and not afterwards? The expression is universall, כלנו *all of us*: and a *man* to his owne way. And if these words may be allowed to respect Jesus Christ at all, they will not beare any such restriction. But this is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of this interpretation; that these are the §. 46.

words

words of the *Jewes* after the destruction of *Jerusalem*; which are the words of the *converted Jewes* and *Gentiles*, after the suffering of Jesus Christ.

§. 47. 2. Why is the sinne confessed, restrained to *Idolatry?* Mens own wayes which they walk in, when they turne from the wayes of God, and know not the wayes of peace, comprehend all their evills of every kind, that their hearts and lives are infected withall.

§. 48. 3. The last words are unworthy a person of much lesse learning, and Judgement then the *Annotatour*. For

1. The word הפגיע *Hiphghiah* (of which before) is interpreted without pretence, warrant, or colour, *Permisit God permitted*. But of that word sufficiently before.

2. By *his suffering unworthy things through our fault*, he understands not the *meritorious* cause of his suffering, but the meanes whereby he suffered; even the unbeliefe & Cruelty of the *Iewes*, which is most remote from the sence of the place.

3. He mentions here distinctly, the *fault* of them that speake, and his *suffering* that is spoken of. *Permisit Deus ut ille nostro gravi crimine indigna pateretur*: when in the Text the fault of them that speake, is the suffering of him that is spoken of. *Our iniquities were laid on him*; that is, the punishment due to them.

4. His suffering in the Text is Gods act: in the *Annotations*, the *Iewes* only.

5. There is neither sence nor coherence in this Interpretation of the words. *We have all sinned, and followed Idols: and God hath suffered him to be evilly intreated by us:* When the whole context evidently gives an account of our deserving, and the wayes whereby we are delivered: And therein a reason of the low and abject condition of the *Messiah* in this world. But of this at large elsewhere.

§. 49. Vers. 7. *He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his Mouth: he is brought as a Lambe to the slaughter, and as a sheepe before her sharers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth.*

Oblatus est, quia ipse voluit, & non aperuit os suum] *in Hebr.* oppressus. & afflictus fuit, & non aperuit os suum. *Sensum bene expresserunt* LXX καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι οὐκ ἤνοιξε τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

Etiam

Etiam tunc cum in Carcerem ageretur, & in locum lutosum nihil fecit, dixitve iracunde.

Sicut ovis] *mitissimum animal.*

Et quasi agnus] *cum quo ipse Ieremias se comparat,* Cap. 11. v. 18.

He was offered because would, and he opened not his mouth] in the Hebrew, he was oppressed and afflicted. The "LXX have well expressed the sence. Because of affliction he "opened not his mouth: Even then when he was thrown into "the prison and mire, he neither did, nor spake any thing "angrily.

As a Sheep] a most mild Creature.

And as a Lamb] wherewith *Jeremiah* compares himselfe, *Chap.* 11. *v.* 18.

The processe of the *words* is to give an account of the same matter formerly insisted on, concerning *ones* suffering for the sinne of others. That the words are spoken of the Lord Jesus, the Holy Ghost hath long since put it out of question, *Act.* 8. 32. And though there be some difficulty and variety in the Interpretation of the first words, yet his patient suffering as the *lamb of God*, typed out by all the Sacrifices of the *Jewes*, under the punishment due to our sinnes, shines through the whole. §. 50.

1. For the words themselves they are נגש והוא which are variously rendred: καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι LXX. And he *for*, or because of affliction. *Oblatus est quia ipse voluit. Vulg. Lat.* He was offered because he would. *Oppressus est & ipse afflictus est. Arias Mont. Exigitur & ipse affligitur, Jun.* it was exacted, and he was afflicted. Others, *It was exacted, and he answered,* which seemes most to agree with the Letter; נגש is sometimes written with the point on the right corner of ש and then it signifies to *approach*, to *draw nigh*; and in the matter of *Sacrifice* it signifies to *offer*, because men *drew nigh* to the Lord in offering: So *Amos* 5. 25. הנשתם לי *Have you made to draw nigh* your offerings and Sacrifices? Or have you *offered*? Thus the *Vulg. Lat.* read the word, and rendred it *Oblatus est*, he was offered. With the point in the left corner, it is to *exact*, to *require*, to *afflict*, to *oppresse*. To *exact* and *require* at the hands of any, is the most common sence of the word. So 2 *King.* 23. 35. *Jehojachim exacted* silver and gold of the people of the Land. Thence §. 51.

is נוגש an *Exactour*, one that *requires* what is impoſed on men Zec. 9. 8. & 10. 4. Being uſed here in a paſſive ſence, it is, *it was exacted, and required of him.* that is, the puniſhment due to our ſinnes was required of Jeſus Chriſt having undertaken to be a ſponſor: And ſo *Junius* hath ſupplyed the words: *Exigitur pœna, Puniſhment was exacted.* And this is more proper, then what we read, *He was oppreſſed*; though that alſo be ſignificant of the ſame thing. How the puniſhment of our ſinne was *exacted* or required of *Jeremiah*, the *Annotatour* declares not.

§. 52. The other word is נענה *Naaneh*; the *Vulg. Lat.* ſeemes to looke to the *active* uſe of the word, to *anſwer*; and therefore renders it *voluit*; he *would*, he *willingly* ſubmitted to it, or he undertook to do that which was exacted. And much may be ſaid for this interpretation from the uſe of the word in Scripture. And then the ſence will be, *it was exacted of him*, or our puniſhment was required of him, & he undertook it with willingneſſe, & patience: ſo it denotes the will of Chriſt in undergoing the penalty due to our ſinnes, which he expreſſeth *Pſal.* 40. 8. *Heb.* 10. 6, 7. Take it in the ſence wherein it is moſt commonly uſed, and it denotes the event of the *exacting* the penalty of our ſinnes of him: *He was afflicted.* In what ſence this may poſſibly be applyed to *Ieremiah*, I leave to the *Annotatour*'s friends to find out.

§. 53. The next words, *He opened not his mouth*, he applyes unto the *Patience* of *Ieremiah*, who did neither *ſpeak*, nor *do* any thing angrily when he was caſt into priſon. Of that honour which we owe to all the Saints departed, and in an eſpeciall manner to the great builders of the Church of God, the Prophets and Apoſtles, this is no ſmall part, that we deliver them from under the burthen of having that aſcribed to them, who are members, which is peculiar to their head. I ſay then, the perfect ſubmiſſion and patience expreſſed in theſe words, was not found in *holy Ieremiah*, who in his *Affliction* and triall *opened his mouth*, and *curſed the day* wherein he was borne: & when he ſays that himſelf was as a *Lamb*, and as an *Oxe* appointed to the ſlaughter, in the ſame place, and at the ſame time he prayes for vengeance on his Adverſaries, *Ierem.* 11. 19. in thoſe words, not denoting his *patience*, but his being expoſed to their *cruelty*.

V. 8.

V. 8. *He was taken from prison and from judgement, and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he smitten.* §. 54.

The person speaking is here changed, as is manifest from the close of the verse, *for the transgression of my people*; who were the speakers before. These then are the words of *God* by the Prophet: and they are not without their difficulties, concerning which the *Reader* may consult *Commentatours* at large. *Grotius* thus

De carcere & judicio ablatus est] *id est, liberatus tandem: Judicium vocat hoc, quia specie judicii ipsi hæc mala imposita fuerunt.* Jerem. 32. 3. *liberatur autem per* Babylonios. *Generationem ejus quis enarrabit?*] *Quis numerare poterit dies vitæ ejus? id est, erit valde longævus. Quia ablcissus est de terra viventium*] *nempe cum actus fuit primum in carcerem, deinde in lacum illum cænosum, & rursum in carcerem.* Grot.

"He was taken from prison and judgement.] that is, he was "at length delivered. He calls it judgement, because these evills "were imposed on him with a pretence of Judgement. But "he was freed by the Babylonians: Who shall declare his gene-"ration?] Who shall be able to number the dayes of his life? "that is, He shall live very long. For he was cut off out of "the land of the living] namely, when he was throwne into the "prison, and then into the miery pit, and then into prison a-"gaine. He adds, *Propter scelus populi mei percussi eum*] in Heb. *est plaga ipsi* (*supple* supervenit) *populi summo errore, ac crimine, ut ante dictum est.* "For the wickedness of my people I have stricken "him] in the Hebrew it is, *Stroke is on him* (that is, befell "him) through the great errour and fault of the people, as is "before said. So farre he.

The sence of these words being a little tryed out, their application will be manifest. The first words are not without their difficulty, מעצר *from prison* say we. The word is from עצר *prohibere, coercere*; to *forbid* and *restraine*: and is no where used for a *prison* directly. The LXX have rendred it, ἐν ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη, in his humility or humiliation, his Judgement or sentence was taken away, referring one of the words to one thing, and another to another. The Vulgar Latine, *Angustia*: *Arias Montanus*, *clausura*: *Junius*, *per coarctationem*: rendring the preposition *by*, not *from*. The §. 55.

word is rendred by us, *oppression*: *Psal.* 107.39. it is at the utmost in reference to a Prison, *clausurum*, a place where any may be shut up: but may as well be rendred *Angustia*, with the *Vulgar Latine*; better *coarctation*, with *Junius*, being taken for any kind of *strait* and restraint. And indeed properly our Saviour was not cast into a Prison, though he was all night under *restraint*. If the intendment of the words be about what he was delivered from, *under which he was*; and not what he was delivered from, that he should not undergoe it, מִמִּשְׁפָּט and *from judgement*, there is no difficulty in the word. Only whose *judgement* it is, that he was taken from, is worth inquiry; whither that of God or man: לֻקַּח he was taken, *ublatus est*. The Vulgar Latine, *he was taken up*. לֻקַּח is *capere, accipere, ferre, tollere*, a word of very large use, both in a good, and in a bad sence; *to be taken up*, it will scarcely be found to signify; *to be taken away*, very often.

§. 56. Now the sence of these words is, that either Christ was *taken away*, that is, *killed* and slaine by his *pressures*, and the *pretended judgement* that was passed on him, or else that he was delivered from the straights and judgement, that might have come upon him. Although he was so afflicted, yet he was taken away from distresse & judgement. *Junius* would have the former sence: & the *exegesis* of the *word, taken away*, by the following words *he was cut off from the Land of the Living*, seeme to require it: In that sence the words are; *By duraunce, restraint*, affliction & judgement, either the Righteous Judgment of God; (as *Junius*) or the pretended *juridicall* processe of men, he was taken away or slain. If I go off from this sence of the words, of all other apprehensions, I should cleave to that of *eternall restraint* or condemnation, from which Christ was delivered in his greatest distresse, *Isa.* 50. 7, 8. *Heb.* 5.7. Though his Afflictions were great, and his pressures sore, yet he was delivered from *eternall restraint* and *Condemnation*; it being not *possible* that he should be detained of death.

§. 57. Applying all this to *Jeremiah*, saies *Grotius*, he was *delivered from prison and judgement by the Babylonians*. That לֻקַּח is *delivered*, & that he was *delivered* by the *Babylonians* frō judgment, after that judgment had passed on him, & sentence been *executed* for many moneths, is strange. But let us proceed to what follows. *Who shall declare his generation?* Who shall speak it, or be able

to

to speak it? דורו *his generation.* דור *is ætas, generatio, sæculum*: gr. γενεὰ, τίς γενεὰν αὐτοῦ διηγήσεται; who shall *expound his generation*, or declare it: that is, though he be so taken away by oppression, and *judgement*, yet his continuance, his *generation*, his abiding shall be such, as *Quis eloquetur?* Who shall speake it? It shall be for ever and ever: for he was to be *satisfied with long, or eternall life, and therein to see the Salvation of God.*

This is (saies *Grotius*) *Who can declare the Generation of Jeremiah? he shall live so great a space of time.* He began his Prophesy when he was *very young*, Ch. 1. v. 5. even in the 13th yeare of *Iosiah*: and he continued Prophesying in *Jerusalem* untill the 11th yeare of *Zedekiah*, about 40 years: and how long he lived after this is uncertain. Probably he might live in all 60 years; whereas it is evident that *Hosea* prophesyed 80 years or very neer. Now that this should be so marvellous a thing, that a man should live 60 or 70 years, that God should *foretell* it, as a strange thing, above twice so many years before, and expresse it by way of *admiration*, that none should be able to declare it, is such an Interpretation of Scripture, as becomes not the *Learned Annotator*. Let the Learned Reader consult *Abarbinel's* Accommodation of these words to *Iosiah*, and he will see what shifts the poor man is put to, to give them any *tolerable* sence. §. 58.

For he was cut off out of the land of the living. ὅτι ἄρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ. *His life was taken from the Earth*: to the sence, not the letter:] נגזר *cut off*, as a branch is cut off a tree; גזר is *abscindere, succidere, extidere*, to cut off. The *Land of the living*, is the state and condition of them that live in this world; so that to be cut off from the Land of the living, is a proper expression for to be *slaine*, as in reference to Christ it is expressed by another word, *Dan.* 9. 26. The meaning of this is, saies *Grotius*, *Jeremiah was cast into the Prison, and into the miery lake. He was cut off out of the Land of the Living*: that is, he was put into Prison twice, and taken out againe. If this be not to offer violence to the word of God, I know not what is. The *Learned man* confesses, that this whole Prophesy belongs to Christ also; but he leaves no sence to the words, whereby they possibly may be applied to him. How was Christ cast into *Prison*, and a miery pit, and taken out from thence by the way of *deliverance?* §. 59.

§. 60. *For the transgression of my People was he stricken.* Of the sence of this expression, that Christ was *smitten*, or that the stroke of punishment was upon him for our sinnes, or the *sinnes* of Gods people, I have spoken before. *Grotius* would have it, *by the sins*, that is, the *People sinned in doing of it*, that is, in putting *Jeremiah* into Prison. The whole Context evidently manifests, and the Preposition in the Relation wherein it stands to sinne and punishment, necessarily requires, that the *impulsive*, and *meritorious*, not the *efficient* cause, be denoted thereby.

§. 61. V. 9. *And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, because he had done no violence, nor was any deceit in his mouth.*

Grot. Et dabit impios pro sepulturâ & divitem pro morte suâ.] *Illi ipsi interficere eum etiam voluerant, ut legimus* Jerem. 26. *At Deus istius vice viros potentes quidem, sed improbos, Sacerdotes nempe, mortem* Jeremiæ *machinatos, morti dedit per* Chaldæos, 2 Reg. 25. 18, 19, 20, 21. *Nihil illis divitiæ suæ profuerunt, quibus redimi se posse speraverant.* Eò quod iniquitatem non fecerit, neq; dolus fuerit in ore ejus.] *quanquam nihil aliud dixerat, quàm quod Deus ei mandaverat.*

" And he shall give the wicked for his grave *or buriall*, and " the Rich for his death.] They would have slaine him, as we " read *Ierem.* 26. But God gave them, that were very power- " full indeed, but wicked, even the Priests that designed his " death, up to Death by the Chaldeans, 2 *King.* 25. 18. their " riches, whereby they hoped to redeeme themselves, profited " them nothing. --- although he had not said any thing, but " what God commanded him.

§. 62. It is confessed, that the first words are full of difficulty, and various are the Interpretations of them: which the Reader may consult in *Expositours*. It is not my work at present to Comment on the Text, but to consider its Accommodation by *Grotius*. The most single sence of the words to mee seems to bee, that Christ being *cut off from* the Land of the Living, had his *Sepulcher* among *wicked* men, being taken down from the Crosse as a Malefactor, and yet was buried in the *Grave of a Rich man*, by *Joseph* of *Arimathea* in his own grave; the consent of which Interpretation with the Text, is discovered by *Forsterus* and *Mercerus*, names of sufficient Authority in all Hebrew literature

terature. The sence that *Grotius* fixes on, is, that *God delivered Ieremiah from death, and gave others to be slaine in his steed, who had contrived his death.* But

1. Of deliverance from death here is no mention; yea he, who is spoken of, was במותיו *in mortibus ejus*, in his deaths, or *under death* and its power. So that it is not, *Others shall dye for him*, but, He *being dead*, under the power of death, his *grave*, or *buriall*, or *Sepulcher*, shall be so disposed of §. 63.

2. There is not any word spoken of *putting others* to death: but of *giving*, or *placing* his Grave with the wicked. Nor were those mentioned in the 2 *King*. 25. 18, 19. that were slaine by the King of *Babel*, as it doth any way appeare, of the *peculiar enemies* of *Ieremiah*; the chiefe of them *Seraiah* being probably he, to whom *Jeremiah* gave his Prophesy against *Babylon*, who is said to be a *quiet Prince*, *Ierem.* 51. 59, 61.

3. It is well that it is granted, that *pro* is as much as *vice: for one*, in *ones* steed: which the *Learned Annotators* friends will scarce allow.

4. The application of those words, *He did no violence, nor was there any deceit found in his mouth*, (which are used to expresse the *absolutely perfect* innocency of the Sonne of God) to any man, who as a man is, or was a lyar, is little lesse then *Blasphemy*, and to restraine them to the Prophets message from God, is devoid of all pretence of plea.

V. 10. *Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him: he shall put him to griefe: when thou shalt make his soule an offering for sinne, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his daies, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.* §. 64.

Tamen Deo visum est eum conterere & infirmare.] *id est*, attenuare fame, illuvie, squalore: *verba activa apud Hebræos sæpè permittendi habent significationem; causa sequitur, cur id Deus permiserit.* Si posuerit pro delicto animam suam, videbit semen longævum.] *verteris rectè*; ut cum semetipsum subiecerit pœnis, videat semen, diuq; vivat. *Hebræis pœna etiam injustè irrogata* אשם *dicitur, quia infligitur si non sonti, certè quasi sonti; sic* חטא *jumi apparet*, Gen. 31. 39. Zech. 14. 19. *Vixit diu* Jeremias *in* Ægypto. *Grot.*

"Yet it seemed good to God to Bruise and Weaken him.] "that is, to weaken him, and bring him downe by hunger, filth

"filth, &c. Active verbs among the Hebrews, have often the "signification of permitting: the Reason followes, why God "suffered this. *If he make his soule &c.*] You shall rightly "read it, that when he hath submitted himselfe to punish-"ments, that then he may see his seed and live long. Amongst "the Hebrews punishment unjustly inflicted, is called *asham*, "because it is inflicted on him that is guilty, or supposed so. "So it is evident, that *Chata* is taken *Gen.* 31. 39. *Zech.* 14. "19. Jeremiah lived long in Egypt.

§. 65. The words and sence are both briefely to be considered. יָחַץ *voluit*; the Lord *would* bruise him: *delectatus est*; Jun: *It pleased the Lord*, say we. The Greek renders this word βέλεται, properly; although in the following words it utterly departs from the originall. The word is not only *velle*, but *voluntatem seu complacentiam habere*, to take delight to doe the thing, and in the doing of it, which we *will* to be done, *Numb.* 14. 8. *Iudges* 13. 23. Our Translation referres it to the *Purpose*, and good pleasure of God; so is the word used *Jonah* 1. 14. and in sundry other places. The Noune of the same signification is used againe in this verse, יַחְפֵּץ and translated, *the pleasure*; *The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper*; that is, the thing which *pleases* him, and which he hath purposed to doe. The purpose and pleasure of the Lord in giving Christ up to death, *Act.* 2. 23. & 4. 26, 27. is doubtlesse that which the Prophet here intends; which also as to the execution of it, is farther expressed, *Zechar.* 13. 7.

§. 66. 2. It pleased the Lord, הַדְכִּיא *eum contundere*; *conterere*, *frangere*: to *bruise*, or *breake* him: in answer to what was said before, v. 5. *he was wounded, he was bruised, &c.*

That which is said to accommodate all this to *Jeremiah*, is, that by all this is intended, that God *permitted* it to be done to him. But,

§. 67. 1. The word *Chaphetz* is no where used in *that* sence, nor will any where beare that Interpretation. And though some *active verbs* in the Hebrew may be interpreted in a sence of *permitting*, or suffering the thing to be done, which is said to be done: Yet that *all may* so be interpreted when we please, without a *cogent Reason* of such an Interpretation; that this verb signifying not only to *will*, but with delight and purpose, should be so interpreted, and that in this place, not admitting of such a Glosse in any

any other place, is that which was *needfull* to be said by the *Learned Annotator*; but with what pretence of Reason or Truth, I know not.

2. As to Christ, to whom he confesseth these words properly to belong, the *proper* sence of the word is to be retained, as hath been shewed; and it is very marveilous, the *improper* sence of the word should be used in reference to him, to whom it *nexily* belongs; and the *proper*, in reference to him, who is more *remotely*, and *secondarily* signifyed. §. 68.

For the second passage; *when*, or *if*, *thou* or *he shall make his soule an offering for sinne*: or as it may be read, *when his soule shall make an offering for sinne*; it may relate either to *God*, giving him up for a Sacrifice, his *Soule* for his *whole humane* nature; or to *Christ*, whose *soule* was, or who offered *himselfe* as a Sacrifice to God, *Eph.* 5 2. Which way soever it be taken, it is peculiar to *Christ*; for neither did God ever make any *one* else an *Offering for sinne*, nor did ever any person but Christ, make *himself* an offering, or had power so to doe, or would have been accepted in so doing. To suit these words to *Ieremiah*, it is said, that אשם in the Hebrew, signifies any punishment, though unjustly inflicted. §. 69.

I will not say that the *Learned Annotator* affirmes this, with a mind to *deceive*; But yet I cannot but think, that as he hath *not* given, so he *could* not give one instance out of the Scripture, of *that* use of the word which he pretends. This I am sure, that his Assertion hath put me to the labour, of considering all the places of Scripture, where the word is used, in the full collections of *Calastius*; and I dare Confidently assure the Reader, that there is *no* colour for this Assertion, nor instance to make it good. The Greekes have rendred it περὶ ἁμαρτίας, *an offering for sinne*; as is expressed, *Rom.* 8. 3. *Heb.* 10. 5, 8. so the word is used *Levit.* 5. 16. & 7. 1. But, §. 70.

If אשם be not used in that sence, yet חטאת is, in *Gen.* 31. 39. *Zechar.* 14 19. But, §. 71.

1. This doth not satisfie, If this *word* may not be so interpreted, which is here used; yet another, which is *not* here used, may be so interpreted; and therefore that which, is *here* used, must have the same sence. Nor,

2. Can he prove that חטאת hath any other signification, but §. 72.

either of sinne, or punishment, or satisfaction; In the first place instanced in, *Gen.* 31. 39. *Iacob* says, that, for that, which was taken away out of the flock of *Laban*, he *expiated* it, he made satisfaction for it, as the Law afterwards required in such cases should be done, *Exod.* 22. 12. And in that place of *Zech.* 14. 19. it is precisely *punishment* for sinne. But this *word* is not in our Text.

Take then the word in any sence that it will admit of, to apply this expression to *Jeremiah*, is no lesse then Blasphemy. To say that either *God*, or *himselfe* made *him* a sacrifice for sinne, is to Blaspheme the *one Sacrifice* of the Son of God.

§. 73. For the next words, *He shall see his seed*, *Grotius* knowes not how to make any application of them to *Ieremiah*, and therefore he speaks nothing of them. How they belong to Christ, is evident, *Psal.* 22. 30. *Heb.* 2. 8, 9. that, *he shall prolong his daies*, is not applicable to *Ieremiah*, of whom the *Annotator* knew not how long he lived in Egypt, hath been formerly declared. Christ *prolonged his daies*, in that notwithstanding that he *was dead*, he *is alive*, and lives for ever.

§. 74. The last clause concerning *the prospering of the good pleasure*, the will, and pleasure of the Lord, in the hand of Jesus Christ, for the *gathering of his Church*, through his blood, and making *peace* between God and Man, hath little relation to any thing, that is spoken of *Jeremiah*, whose *ministry* for the conversion of soules, doth not seem to have had any thing eminent in it above other Prophets; yea *falling* in a time, when the Wickednesse of the People, to whom he was sent, was come up to the *height*, his message seemed to be almost totally rejected.

§. 75. V. 11. *He shall see of the travaile of his soule, and shall be satisfied: By his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities.*

The *event*, and glorious *issue* of the suffering of Christ, in respect of *himselfe* and others, with the Reason thereof, is briefly comprised and expressed in this verse.

Grot. Videbit & saturabitur.] *videbit diu ad satietatem: simile loquendi genus in Hebræo.* Gen. 25. 8. & 35. 19. 1 Paralip. 23. 1, & 29. 28. 2 Paral. 24. 14.

In scientiâ suâ.] *per eam quam habet Dei cognitionem.*

Justificabit ipse justus servus meus multos.] *Exemplo & institutione*

tutione corriget multos, etiam ex gentibus. Hæc est maximè propria verbi הצדיק *significatio, & Græci* δικαιοῦν, *ut apparet* Dan. 12. 3. Apocal. 22. 11. *& alibi sæpè.*

Et iniquitates eorum ipse portabit.] *id est*, auferet, *per μετωνυμίαν, quia qui sordes aliquas auferunt, solent eos collo supposito portare: Abstulit* Jeremias *multorum peccata, ita ut diximus, corrigendo.*

"*He shall see and be satisfied*] he shall see long, unto satiety; the like phrase of speech you have in the Hebrew, *Gen.* 25. 8. &c. *By his knowledge*] By that knowledge which he hath of God. *He shall justify many.*] by his example and institution he shall convert many, even from among the Heathen: this is the most proper sence of the word הצדיק and of δικαιοῦν in the Greek; as appeareth *Dan.* 12. 3. *Revel.* 22. 11. &c. *For he shall bare their iniquities*] that is, take them away, by a Metonymy: because those that take away filth, use to take it on their necks, and beare it. *Jeremiah* took away the sinnes of many, as was said, by correcting or amending them.

The intelligent Reader will easily perceive the whole *Socinian* poyson, about the Death of Christ, to be infolded in this Interpretation. His knowledge is the *knowledge* that he had of God, and his Will, which he declares: to *justify*, is to *amend mens lives*, and to *beare sinne*, is to take it away. According to the Analogy of this Faith, you may apply the Text to whom you please, as well as to *Jeremiah*. But the words are of another import, as we shall briefely see. §. 76.

1. Those words מעמל נפשו which the vulgar Latine renders, *pro eo quod laboravit*: ad verbum, *propter laborem animæ suæ*, which expresse the *object* of the *seeing* mentioned, and that wherewith he was *satisfied*, are not taken notice of. The *travaile of the soule* of Christ, is the fruit of his *labour*, *travaile*, and suffering: this, saies the Prophet, he *shall see*, that is, *receive*, *perceive*, *enjoy*; as the verbe ראה in many places signifies: verbes of sence with the Hebrews, having very large significations: ישבע *saturabitur*, he shall be *full*, and *well contented*, and pleased with the fruit that he shall have of all his labour, and Travaile: This (saith *Grotius*) is, *He shall see to satiety*, whereby he intends he should *live very long*, as is evident from the places whither he sends us, for an Exposition of these words, *Gen.* 25. 8. &c. in all

which mention is made of men that were *old*, and *full of daies*.

§. 77. 1. But to *live to satiety*, is to live till a man be weary of living, which may not be ascribed to the Prophet.

2. This of his *long life*, was spoken of immediatly before, according to the Interpretation of our *Annotator*, and is not (probably) instantly again repeated.

3. The long *life* of *Jeremiah* by way of eminency above others, is but pretended, as hath been evinced. But

4. How came this word *to see*, to be taken *neutrally*, and to signify *to live*? What instance of this sence, or use of the word can be given? I dare boldly say, not one: He shall *see* unto satiety, that is, *he shall live long*.

5. The words *videbit*; *saturabitur*, do not stand in any such *relation* to one another, or construction, as to endure to be cast into this forme: It is not, *videbit diu ad satietatem*; much lesse, *vivet ad satietatem*, but *videbit, saturabitur*.

6. The word *shall see*, evidently relates to the words going before, *the travaile of his soule*: If it had been, *he shall see many years, or many daies, and be satisfied*; it had been something. But it is, *He shall see of the travaile of his soule, and be satisfied*.

§. 78. 2. By his knowledge בדעתו *in*, or *by his knowledge*, *in scientiâ suâ, Vulg. Lat. Cognitione sui, Jun.* The LXX wholly pervert all the words of this verse, except the last, as they do also of the former. That by the *knowledge* here mentioned, is meant the knowledge of Christ taken *objectively*, and not the *knowledge* of God taken *actively*, as our *Annotator* supposes, is evident from the fruit that is ascribed hereunto, which is the justification of them that have that knowledge. By his knowledge, that is, the *knowledge of him*, they shall be justified, *Phil.* 3 8. So, *teach me thy feare*, that is, *the feare of thee: my worship*, that is, *the worship of mee*. No *knowledge of God* in the Land. But the use of this is in the next words.

§. 79. *My righteous Servant shall justify many*: that this terme used thus absolutely, *My righteous servant*, is not applied to any in the Scripture besides *Jesus Christ*, hath been declared, especially, where that is ascribed to him, which here is spoken of, can it be no otherwise understood. יצדיק *shall justify*, that is, shall *absolve* from their sinnes, and pronounce them Righteous. *Grotius* would have the word here to signify, *to make holy and Righte-*

ous

ous by instruction and institution, as *Dan.* 12 3. and *διδασκων*, *Revel.* 22. 11. That both these words are to be taken in a *forensicall* signification, that commonly, mostly they are so taken in the Scriptures, that scarce *one* and *another* instance can be given to the contrary, that in the *matter* of our Acceptation with God through Christ, they can no otherwise be interpreted, hath been abundantly manifested by those, who have written of the *doctrine of justification* at large; that is not now my present businesse. This I have from the Text, to lay in the way of the Interpretation of the *Learned Annotator*: the Reason, and Foundation of this justification here mentioned, is in the following words, which indeed beere the sence of the whole Text. *For he shall bear their iniquities.* Now what *justification* of men is a proper effect of anothers *bearing their iniquities?* Doubtlesse the acquitting of them from the guilt of their sinnes, on the account of their sinnes being so borne, and no other. But,

Sayes our *Annotatour*, To *beare their sinnes, is to take them away*, by a *figurative* expression: If this may not be understood, I suppose every one will confesse, that the *Annotator* hath laboured in vaine, as to his whole endeavour of applying this *Prophesy* unto *Ieremiah*. If by *bearing our iniquities*, be intended the *undergoing of the punishment* of those *iniquities*, & not the *delivering* men frō their *iniquities*, the whole *matter* here *treated* of, can relate to none but *Iesus Christ*, & to him it doth relate in the *sence* contended for. Now to evince this sence we have al the *Arguments* that any place is capable to receive the confirmation of its proper sence by. §. 80.

For 1. The word as is confessed, signifies properly to *beare* or *carry*, and not to *take away*; Nor is it ever otherwise used in the Scripture, as hath beenn declared, and the the proper use of a word is not to be departed from, & a figurative admitted without great necessity. §. 18.

2. The whole phrase of speech of *bearing iniquity* is constantly in the Scripture used for bearing or undergoing the punishment due to sin, as hath been proved by instances in abundance; nor can any instance to the contrary be produced.

3. The manner whereby Christ *bare the iniquities of men*, as described in this Chapter, namely by being *wounded*, *bruised put to griefe*, will admit of no interpretation, but that by us inflicted on. From all which it is evident, how violently the Scrip-

ture is here perverted by rendring, *My righteous servant shall justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities*, by, *Ieremiah shall instruct many in godlinesse and so turne them from their sinnes.*

§. 82. V. the last. *Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoile with the strong, because he hath poured out his soule unto death, and he was numbred with transgressors, and he beare the sinnes of many, and made intercession for the Transgressours.*

A further fruit of the travaile of the Lord Christ in his conquest over all oppositions, in the victory he obtained, the *spoiles* that he made, expressed after the manner of the things of men, with the causes and antecedents of his Exaltation, is summarily compriſed in these last words. Hereof thus *Grotius.*

Dispartiam ei plurimos.] *Dabo ei partem in multis:* id est, *multos servabunt* Chaldæi *in ejus gratiam, vide* Jerem. 39. 17. Et fortium dividet spolia.] *id est, Nabuzardan Magister militum, capta urbe, de præda ipsi dona mittet.* Jer. 40. 5. *Oblatus etiam ipsi a* Chaldæis *locus quantum vellet.* Pro eo quod tradidit in mortem animam suam] *in Hebræo*, Quia effudit in mortem animam suam, *id est, periculis mortis semet objecit, colendo* veritatem quæ odium parit. *Vide historiam ad hanc rem oppositam*, Jerem. 26. 13. *Sic* τιθέναι ψυχὴν *dici pro periculo mortis semet objicere diximus ad* Joh. 10. 11. Et cum sceleratis reputatus est] *Ita est tractatus quo modo scelerati solent in carcere, catenis & barathro.* Et peccata multorum tulit] *pessime tractatus fuit permultorum improbitatem uti sup.* v. 5. Et pro Transgressoribus rogavit] פגע *est* depr ecari: *Sensus est, eo ipso tempore cum tam dura paterentur a populis, non cessavit ad Deum preces pro eis fundere, vide* Jerem. 14. 7. &c.

I will divide him a portion with the great, or many] that "is, the Chaldeans shall preserve many for his sake *Ierem.* 39. "17. *He shall divide the spoile with the strong,*] that is, *Nabu-* "*zardan* the chiefe Captain, the City being taken, shall send "him gifts of the prey, *Ier.* 40. 5. As much land also as he would "was offered him by the Chaldeans. *Because he poured out* "*his soule unto death*] that is, he exposed himselfe to the "dangers of death, by following truth, which begets hatred. "See *Iere.* 26. 13. τιθέναι ψυχὴν is spoken for exposing a mans "life to danger of death. *He bare the sinne of many*] or was "evilly treated by the wickednes of the many. *And made inter-* "*cession for the Toansgressours;*] he prayed for the People, &c.

To

To runne briefely over this expofition §. 83.

1. *I will divide him a portion with the great*, that is, the *Chaldees* ſhall ſave many for his ſake. How is this proved? *Ierem* 39 17, 18. Where God ſayes, *he will ſave Ebedmelech, becauſe he put his truſt in him*: Such is the iſſue commonly, when men will wreſt the Scripture to their own imaginations. Such are their proofes of what they affirme.

2. *He ſhall divide the ſpoyle with the ſtrong*: that is, the Citty being taken, the *Captaines of the guard* gave him victualls, and a reward, and ſet him at liberty, as we read *Jerem.* 40. 5.

3. *Becauſe he powred out his ſoule to death*; that is, he *ventured his life* by preaching the truth; although he did not dye. For

4. *He bare the ſin of many*: that is, by the *wickedneſſe of many he was wronged*; though this expreſſion in the verſe foregoing be interpreted, *he ſhall take away their ſinnes*: and that when a word of a more reſtrained ſignification is uſed to expreſſe *bearing*, then that here uſed. At this rate a man may make application of what he will, to whom he will. §. 84.

Upon the ſence of the words, and their accompliſhment in and upon the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, I ſhall not inſiſt. That they do not reſpect *Jeremiah* at all, is eaſily evinced from the conſideration of the intollerable wreſting of the words, and their ſence by the *Learned Annotator*, to make the leaſt alluſion appeare betwixt what *befell* him, and what is *expreſſed*.

To cloſe theſe *Animadverſions*, I ſhall deſire the *Reader* to obſerve

1. That there is not any Application of theſe words made to the Prophet *Ieremiah*, that *ſuits* him in any meaſure; but what may alſo be made to any Prophet, or Preacher of the word of God, that met with affliction and perſecution, in the diſcharge of his duty, and was delivered by the preſence of God with him: So that there is no reaſon to perſwade us, that *Ieremiah* was peculiarly intended in this Propheſy.

2. That the *Learned Annotatour*, though he profeſſe that Jeſus Chriſt was intended in the letter of this Scripture, yet hath interpreted the whole, not only without the leaſt *mention of Jeſus Chriſt*, or *application* of it unto him, but alſo hath ſo opened the *ſeverall words* and expreſſions of it, as to leave no place nor roome for the maine Doctrine of his Satisfaction here principally intended. And how much the Church of God is beholding

ding to him for his paine and travaile herein, the Reader may judge.

CHAP. XXVI.

Of the matter of the punishment that Christ underwent, or what he suffered.

§. 1. HAving dispatched this *Digression*, I returne again to the consideration of the death of Christ, as it was a *punishment* which shall now be pursued unto its issue.

The third thing proposed to the Consideration on this *Account* was the *matter* of this punishment that Christ underwent which is commonly expressed by the name of his Death.

Death is a name comprehensive of all *evill*, of what nature, or of what kind soever: All that was threatned, all that was ever inflicted on man: though much of it fall within the compas of this life, and short of death, yet it is evill purely on the account of its *Relation* to Death, and its tendency thereunto; which when it is taken away, it is no more *generally*, and *absolutely* evill, but in some regard only.

§. 2. The *death* of Christ as comprehending his *punishment*, may be considered two wayes.

1. In its *selfe*.
2. In reference to the Law.

On the first head, I shall only consider the generall *evident concomitants* of it, as they lye in the story, which are all set down, as aggravations of the *Punishment* he underwent.

In the latter, give an account of the whole, in refrence to the *Law*.

§. 3. 1. Of death *naturall*, which in its whole nature is penall, (as hath been elsewhere evinced) there are foure *Aggravations* whereunto all others may be referred. As 1. that it be *violent* or bloody. 2. That it be *ignominious* or *shamefull*. 3. That it be *lingring* and *painefull*. 4. That it be *legall* and *accursed*. And all these to the hight, *met* in the Death of Christ.

1. He

1. It was *violent* and bloody, hence he is said to be §. 4.
1. *Slaine*, Act. 2. 23. ἀνείλετε, *ye have slaine.*
2. *Killed*, Act. 3. 15. ἀπεκτείνατε, *ye have killed.*
3. *Put to Death*, *Joh.* 18. 31, 32.
4. *Cut off*, *Dan.* 9. 26.

The *death* of Christ, and the *blood* of Christ, are on this account in the Scripture the same. His death was by the *effusion* of his blood; and what is done by his Death, is still said to be done by his *blood*. And though he willingly gave up himselfe to *God* therein, as he was a Sacrifice, yet he was taken by *violence*, and nailed to the Crosse, as it was a *punishment*: and the *dissolution* of his *body* and *soule* was by a meanes no lesse *violent*, then if he had been most *unwilling* thereunto.

2. It was *ignominious* and shamefull. Such was the Death §. 5.
of the *Crosse. The death of *Slaves*, *Malefactors*, *Robbers*, *Pests* of the earth, and burthens of humane society; like those crucifyed with him. Hence he is said to be *obedient to Death*, *the death of the Crosse*, *Phil.* 2. 8. that *shamefull* and ignominious death. And when he *endured the Crosse*, he despised the *shame* also, *Heb.* 12. 2. To be brought *forth* scourged as a *Malefactor*, amongst *Malefactors*, in the *eye* of the world, made a scorne and a by word, men *wagging* the head, and making *mouths* at him in *derision*, when he was full of *torture bleeding* to death, is no small aggravation of it. Hence the most frequent expression of his death is by the *Crosse*, and *Crucifying*.

* Σκελοκοπία, *seu cruci fragium ut crux ipsa, servorum quasi peculiare supplicium fuit.* Lipsius. *Sublimes extra ordinem aliquæ statuebantur cruces; & exempla edenda erant in famosa persona, & ob atrox facinus, aut si hoc supplicio venret afficiendus ille, cujus odium erat apud omnes flagrantissimum*; Salmas. de Cruce: which seemes to be the case in the Crosse of Christ: between these of the thieves. *Bene addit crucem, nam servorum non civium cruces erat supplicium.* Nannius, in Terent. And. Ac. 3. *Noli minitari. Scio Crucem futuram mihi sepulchrum: ibi mei majores sunt siti: pater, avus, proavus, abavus: semm apud* Plaut. Mil. Glor. 2. 4. 19. Vid. Trach. Histor. lib. 2. 22. Vulcat in Avid. Lassio. cap. 4. Capitolin. in Macrin. cap. 12. Luc. florus lib 3. cap 19.

3. It was *lingring*: It was the voice of *cruelty* it selfe, con- §. 6.
cerning one who was condemned to dye: *sentiat se mori: let him so die that he may feele himselfe dying*; and of *one*, who to escape torture killed himselfe, *evasit*, *he escaped me*: *suddaine* death though *violent*, is an *escape from* torture. Such was this of Christ. From his *Agony* in the garden, when he began to dye, (all the powers of *hell* being then let loose upon him) untill the *giving* up of the

Ghoſt, it was from the *evening* of *one* day to the *evening* of another: from his *ſcourging* by *Pilate*, after which he was under continuall paine, and ſuffering in his ſoule, in his body, to his death, it was ſix houres; & all this while was he under exquiſite tortures, as on very many conſiderations might eaſily be manifeſt.

§. 7. 4. It was *legall*; and ſo an *Accurſed* death. There was *proceſſe* againſt him by *witneſſe* and *judgement*: Though they were indeed all *falſe* and *unjuſt*, yet to the *eye* of the world, his death was *legall*, and conſequently *accurſed*. *Gal.* 3. 13. *Curſed is every one that hangeth on a tree*: that is, becauſe of the *doome* of the Law; whoſe ſentence is called a *curſe*, *Deut.* 27. 29. ſuch was that of Chriſt, *Iſa.* 53. 4.

§. 8. 2. As all theſe Aggravations attended his death, as it was death it ſelfe, ſo there was an *univerſality* in all the concernements of it, as it was a legall *puniſhment*. Briefely to give ſome inſtances.

1. There was an *univerſality* of *efficient* Cauſes: Whether *principall* or *inſtrumentall*. The firſt great diviſion of *cauſes efficient*, is into the Creator and the Creatures, and both here concurred.

1. The *Creator*, God himſelfe *laid it upon him*; He was not only *delivered by his determinate counſell*, Acts 2. 22, 23. Acts 4. 27, 28. not *ſpared* by him, but given up to *death*, Rom. 8. 32. but, it *pleaſed him to bruiſe him, and to put him to griefe*, Iſa. 53. 10. as alſo to *forſake* him, *Pſal.* 22. 1. ſo acting in his puniſhment, by the *immiſſion* of that which is evill, & the *ſubſtraction* of that which is good; ſo putting the *cup* into his hand, which he was to drink, & mixing the *wine* thereof for him, as ſhall afterward be declared.

§. 9. 2. Of Creatures one generall diviſion is into *intelligent*, and *brute* or *irrationall*, and both theſe alſo in their *ſeverall* ways concurred to his puniſhment; as they were to do by the *ſentence* and *curſe of the Law*.

Intelligent Creatures are diſtinguiſhed into *ſpirituall* and *inviſible*, or *viſible* and corporeall alſo.

Of the firſt ſort are *Angells* and *Divells*; which agree in the ſame nature, differing only in *qualities*, and *ſtates* or Conditions. Of all *things*, the *Angells* ſeeme to have no hand in the Death of Chriſt; for being not Judge, as was God, nor *oppoſite* to God

as

as is Sathan, nor under the *curse* of the Law, as is mankind, and the reliqua of the Creatures, though they had *inestimable* benefit by the Death of Christ, yet neither by *demerit*, nor efficacy, as is *revealed*, did they adde to his punishment: Only whereas it was their Duty to have preserved him being *innocent*, and in his *way*, from violence and fury, their assistance was withheld. §. 10.

But from that sort of *spirituall invisible* Creatures, he suffered in the attemps of the Divell.

Christ looked on him at a distance in his approach to set upon him: *the prince of this world (*saith he*) commeth*, John 14.30. He saw him coming with all his malice, fury, and violence to set upon him, to ruine him if it were possible: And that he had a *close combate* with him on the crosse, is evident from the conquest that Christ there made of him, *Col:* 2. 15. which was not done without *wounds*, and *blood*, when he brake the *Serpents head*, the serpent *bruised* his *heele*, Gen: 3. 15. §. 11.

2. For *men*; the second ranke of *intellectuall* Creatures; they had their *influence* into this punishment of Christ, in all their *distributions*, that on any account they were cast into.

1. In respect of *Country* or Nation, and the priviledges thereon attending. The whole World on this account is divided into *Jewes* and *Gentiles*; and both these had their Efficiency in this businesse, *Psal.* 2. 1. *Why did the Heathen rage, and the people imagine a vaine thing?* *Heathens* and *People*, *Gentiles* and *Iews*, are all in it, as the place is interpreted by the Apostles, *Acts* 4. 25, 26. And to make this the more *eminent*, the great Representative of the two *People* conspired in it; the *Sanhedrym* of the *Iews*, and the body of the People in the *Metropoliticall* Citty, on the one hand; and the *Romans*, for the Gentiles, who then were *rerum Domini*, and govern'd ἡγεμονεύω, as *Luke* tells us, Chap. 2. 1. The whole on both hands is expressed *Math.* 20. 18, 19. §. 12.

2. As to Order, men are distinguished into *Rulers*, and those under Authority, and both sorts herein concur'd.

1. *Rulers* are either *Civill* or *Ecclesiasticall*: both which (notwithstanding all their Divisions) conspir'd in the death of Christ.

1. For *Civill Rulers*, as it was foretold, *Psal.* 2. 2. *Psal.* 22. 12. so it was *accomplished*, *Acts* 4. 25, 26. The story is known of the concurrence of *Herod* & *Pilate* in the thing: the one *Ruler*

of the place where he lived, and converſed; the Other, of the Place, where he was taken and *Crucified*.

2. For *Eccleſiaſticall* Rulers; What was done by the *Prieſts*, and all the Councell of the Elders, is known. The matter of fact need not be inſiſted on; indeed, they were the great *contrivers*, and malitious *plotters* of his death; uſing *all waies* and means for the accompliſhing of it, *Acts* 3.17. in particular, *Annas*, the uſurper of the Prieſthood, ſeems to have had a great hand in the *buſineſſe*, and therefore to him was he firſt carried.

§.13. 2. For thoſe *under* Authority: beſides what we have in the Story, *Peter* tells the Body of the People, *Acts* 2.23. that *they took him, and with wicked hands crucified him, and ſlew him*: and Ch: 3.15. *That they killed the Prince of life*; ſo *Zech.* 12.10. not only the *houſe of David*, the *Rulers*, but the *inhabitants* of *Ieruſalem*, the *people*, are ſaid to *pierce* him, and thence, *they who pierced him*, is a *periphraſis* of the Jews. *Rev.* 1.7. after, every *eye ſhall ſee him*, there is a diſtribution into them that *pierced* him, that is, the *Iewes*, and all the *kindreds of the Earth*, that is, the *Gentiles*. The very *rabble* was ſtirred up to cry *crucify him, crucify him*, and did it accordingly, *Math*: 27.20. And they all conſented as *one man* in the cry, *v.* 22. and that with violence and clamour, v. 23. *abjects made Mouthes at him*, *Pſal.* 35.15. *Pſal*: 22.6.

§.14. 3. Diſtinguiſh man in Relation to *himſelfe*, either upon a *naturall*, or a *morall* account, as his *kindred* and *relations*, or *ſtrangers*, & they will appeare to be all engaged: but this is ſo compriz'd in the former diſtinction of *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, that it need not be inſiſted on.

2. On a *Morall* account, as they were either his *friends* or his *Enemies*, he ſuffered from both.

1. His *Friends*, all his *Diſciples* forſook him, and *fled*, *Mat*: 26. 56. the *worſt* of them *betrayed* him, *Mat.* 26.14. & the *beſt* of them *denied* him, v. 10. and ſo there was *none to help*, *Pſal*: 22.11.

And if it were thus with *him* in the houſe of his friends, what may be expected from

2. His *Enemies*; their *malice* and *conſpiracy*, their implacableneſſe and cruelty, their plotting and accompliſhment of their deſignes, take up ſo great a part of the Hiſtory of his Crucifying, that I ſhall not need inſiſt on particular inſtances.

§.15. Yea mankind was engaged, as diſtinguiſhed into *Sexes*. Of men

men of all sorts, you have heard already: and that tempting, ensnaring, captious question of the *Maid* to *Peter* manifests, that amongst his Persecutors, there were of that *Sex* also, *Matth:* 26. 69.

Of mens distinction by their employments, of *Souldiers, Lawyers, Citizens, Divines*, all concurring to this work: I shall not adde any thing to what hath been spoken.

§. 16. Thus the first Order of Creatures, those that are *intellectuall*, were *universally*, at least with a *distributive universality*, engaged in the suffering of the Lord Jesus; and the Reason of this generall engagement, was, because the Curse, that was come upon them for sinne, had filled them all with *Enmity* one against another. 1. Fallen Man, and Angells, were engaged into an *everlasting Enmity*, on the first *Entrance* of sinne, *Gen:*3 15,16. 2. Men one towards another were filled with *malice*, and *envy*, and *hatred*, *Titus* 3.3.

3. The *Jewes* and *Gentiles* were engaged by way of visible *representation* of the Enmity which was come on all Mankind, *Joh:*4.9. *Eph:*2,15,16,17. and therefore he who was to undergoe the whole *Curse* of the Law, was to have the rage and fury of them all executed on him. As I said before, all their *persecution* of him concerned not his death, as it was a *sacrifice*, as he made his soule an *Offering for sinne*; but as it was a *punishment*, the utmost of their Enmity was to be executed towards him.

§. 17. 2. The residue of the *Creatures* concur'd thus farre to his sufferings, as to manifest themselves at that time, to be *visibly* under the *Curse* and indignation, that was upon Him, and so withdrew themselves as it were, from yeilding him the least assistance. To instance in generall, *Heaven* and *Earth* lost their glory, and *that* in them which is *usefull* and *comfortable* to the Children of Men, without which all the other Conveniences, and Advantages, are *as* a thing of nought: The *Glory* of Heaven, is its *light*, *Psal:*19 1,2. And the glory of the *Earth*, is its *stability*; He hath *fixed the Earth, that it shall not be moved.*

Now both these were lost at once. The *Heavens* were *darkned*, when it might be expected in an *ordinary* course, that the Sun should have *shone* in its full beauty, *Matth:*27.45. *Luke* 23.44,45. And the *Earth* lost its *stability*, and *shooke* or trembled, v: 51. and the *rocks* rent, and the *graves* opened; all *Evidences* of that dis-

ſpleaſure againſt ſinne, which *God* was then putting in execution to the utmoſt, *Rom.* 1.18.

Thus firſt in his *ſuffering* there was an *univerſality* of *efficient* cauſes.

§. 18. 2. There was an *univerſality* in reſpect of the *Subject*, wherein he ſuffered. He ſuffered, 1. In his *Perſon*, 2. In his *Name*, 3. In his *Friends*, 4. In his *Goods*; as the Curſe of the Law extended to *all*, and that *univerſally* in all theſe.

1. In his *Perſon*, or his *Humane Nature* in his Perſon; he ſuffered in the two *eſſentiall conſtituent* parts of it: His *Body*, and his *Soule*.

1. His *Body*. In generall, as to its *integrall* parts; his *Body was broken*, 1 *Cor.* 11.24. and *Crucified*; his *Blood* was *ſhed*, or poured out.

2. His *Soul*. His Soul *was made an Offering* for ſinne, *Iſa.* 53. 10. And his Soul *was heavy unto Death*, *Math.* 26. 37,38.

2. In particular: his *Body ſuffered in all its concernments*, namely, all his *Senſes*, and all its *parts* or members.

§. 19. 1. In all its *Senſes*: as to inſtance,

1. In his *feeling*; he was *full of Paine*, which made him, as he ſayes, *cry for diſquietneſſe*; and this is compriſed in every one of thoſe expreſſions, which ſay he was *Broken*, *Pierced*, and lived ſo *long* on the Croſſe, in the midſt of moſt exquiſite torture; untill being full of *paine*, he cryed out, and *gave up the Ghoſt*, *Math.* 27. 50.

2. His *Taſting*. When he *fainted* with loſſe of Blood, and grew thirſty, they gave him *Gall and Vineger to drinke*, *Math.* 27. 34. *Ioh.* 19. 29. *Math.* 27. 48. not to Stupify his ſenſes, but to encreaſe his Torment.

3. His *Seeing*. Though not ſo much in the *naturall Organ* of it, as in its uſe. He *ſaw his Mother*, and *Diſciples* ſtanding by, full of Griefe, Sorrow, and Confuſion, which exceedingly encreaſed his Anguiſh and Perplexity, *Ioh.* 19. 25, 26. And he ſaw his Enemies full of *Rage* and *Horror*, ſtanding round about him, *Pſal* 22. He ſaw them *paſſing* by, and *wagging* the head in ſcorn, *Math.* 29, 39. *Pſal.* 22. 7, 8.

4. His *Eares* were filled with *Reproach* and Blaſphemy, of which he *grievouſly* complaines, *Pſal.* 22. 7, 8, 16. which alſo is expreſſed in its *Accompliſhment*, *Math.* 27. 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44.

Luke

Luke 23. 36,37,38. They reproach'd him with his *God*, and his *Ministry*, and his *Profession*: as did also one of the *Theeves* that was crucified with him. And

5. They crucifyed him in a *noysome place*, a place of *stink* and *loathsomenesse*: a place where they cast the *dead bodies* of men, from whose bones it got the name of *Golgotha*, a place of dead mens sculles, *Matth*: 26.33.

2. He *suffered* in all the *Parts* of his Body; especially those, which are most tender and full of Sense. §. 20.

1. For his *Head*, they platted a *Crowne of Thornes*, and put it on him; and to Encrease his paine, smote it on (that the Thornes might pierce him the deeper) with their *staves*, *Matth*: 27. 28,29. as the Jewes had *stricken* him before, Ch:26.68. *Joh*. 19. 2, 3.

2 His *Face* they spit upon, *buffeted*, *stroke*, and *plucked off his haire*, *Isa*:50 6. *Matth*:26 67,68.

3 His *Back* was torne with *whippes* and scourges, *Matth*: 27. 27. *Joh*:19.1. ἐμαστίγωσε; there they made long their *furrowes*.

4 His *Hands*, and *Feet*, and *Side*, were pierced with nailes and Speares, *Psal* 22.16.

5 To expresse the residue of his Body, and the Condition of it, when he hung on the Crosse so long by the *Soreneſſe* of his Hands and his Feet, saies he, all my *Bones* are out of joynt, *Psal*: 22.17. and also v: 14,15.

Thus was it with his *Body*, the like also is expressed of his *Soule*, for

1 On his *Mind* was *darkneſſe*; not *in* it, but *on* it, as to his *Apprehension* of the Love and Presence of God. Hence was his cry, *Psal*:22.1. *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Matth*: 27. 46. Though his Faith was upon the whole of the matter *prevalent* and victorious, *Isa*:50 8,9: Yet he had many *sore conflicts* with the *sense* and apprehension of Gods wrath for sinne, and that desertion he was then under, as to any cheering *influences* of his Love and Presence. §. 21.

For *the rest* of his faculties, he was not only under the *pressure* of the most *perplexing*, grievous, and burthensome *passions*, that humane nature is obnoxious unto, as, 1. *Heavineſſe*, *His soul was heavy unto death*, *Matth*: 26.37.

2 *Griefe*; No *Sorrow like to his*, *Lament*. 1. 12.

3 *Feare*

3 *Feare, Heb.* 5.7. But also was prefſed into a condition, beyond what we have words to expreſſe, or names of paſſions, or affections to ſet it forth by. Hence he is ſaid to be in an *Agony, Luke* 22. 44. to be *amazed, Marke* 14.33. with the like expreſſions, intimating a condition *miſerable* and diſtreſſed, beyond what we are able to comprehend or expreſſe.

§. 22 2 In his *Name*, his *Repute*, or credit, he ſuffered alſo; He was *numbered amongſt Tranſgreſſors, Iſa*: 53:11. *Pſal.* 22. counted a *malefactor*, and crucified amongſt them; a *Seducer*, a *Blaſphemer*, a *Seditious* perſon, a *Falſe Prophet*, and was cruelly *mocked*, and derided on the Croſſe, as an *Impoſtor*, that *ſaved* others, but could not *ſave* himſelfe; that pretended to be the *Meſſias*, the *King* of Iſrael, but could not come down from the *Croſſe*; laid in the ballance with *Barrabas*, a *Rogue* and a *Murtherer*, and rejected for him.

§. 23. 3 In his *Friends*; The *Shepheard was Smitten, and the ſheep ſcattered, Zech*: 13.7. All his Friends *diſtreſſed, ſcattered*, glad to fly for their lives, or to ſave themſelves, by doing the *things* that were worſe then death.

4 In his *Goods*; even all that he had; *they parted his Garments, and caſt lots for his Veſture, Pſal*: 22.18. Thus did he not in any thing go free; that the *Curſe* of the *Law* in all things might be executed on him; the Law curſes a man in all his *Concernements*; with the immiſſion and infliction of every thing that is evill, and the *ſubſtraction* of every thing that is good: that is, with *pæna ſenſus, & pæna damni*, as they are called.

§. 24. In reference to the *Law*, I ſay, that Chriſt underwent that *very puniſhment*, that was threatned in the Law, and was due to *ſinners*. The *ſame* that we ſhould have undergone, had not our *Surety* done it for us; to cleere this briefely obſerve

1. That the *Puniſhment* of the Law may be conſidered two waies.

1 *Abſolutely* in its own nature, as it lies in the Law, and the *threatning* thereof. This in generall is called *Death, Gen*: 3. 15. *Ezek*. 15.4. *Rom*: 5.12. And by way of Aggravation, becauſe of its comprizing the *death* of *Body* and *Soul*, *death unto death*, 2 *Cor*: 2. 16. and the *ſecond death*, *Rev*: 20. 14. and the *curſe*, *Deut*. 27. 29. and *Matth*: 25. 41. and *wrath*, &c. hence we are ſaid to be delivered from *wrath* to come, 1 *Theſſ*. 1.10, *Rom*: 2.5. *wrath, or the day*

of

of wrath: and in innumerable other places; all which are set out in many *metaphoricall* expressions by those things, which are to the Nature of man most *dreadfull*; as of a *Lake with fire and brimstone*; of *Tophet* whose pile is *much wood*, and the like.

Of this punishment in generall there are two parts.

1. *Losse*, or separation from God, expressed in these words, *Depart from mee, Math:* 7. 23. *Go ye cursed, Math:* 25. 41. as also 2 *Thess:* 1. 9. §. 25.

2 *Sense or paine*, whence it is called *fire*; as 2 *Thess.* 1. 9. *Torments, &c.* All this we say Christ *underwent*, as shall be farther manifested.

2 *Punishment* of the *Law* may be considered *relatively*, to its *subject*, or the Person Punished, and that in two regards. §. 26.

1 In reference to its own *attendencyes*, and necessary consequents, as it falls upon the Persons to be punished; and these are two.

1 That it be a *worme* that dieth not, *Math.* 9. 44. *Isa.* 66. 24.

2 That it be a *fire, not to be quenched*, that it be *everlasting*, that its *torments* be *eternall*: and both these I say *attend* and follow the punishment of the *Law*, on the account of its *relation* to the persons punished; for

1 The *Worme*, is from the *inbeing*, and everlasting abiding of a mans *own* sinne; that tormenting anguish of Conscience, which shall perplex the damned to Eternity, attends their punishment, meerely from their own *sinne* inherent; this Christ could not undergoe. The *worme* attends not *sinne imputed*, but sinne *inherent*; especially not *sinne imputed* to him, who underwent it Willingly; It being the *cruciating* vexation of mens *own thoughts*, kindled by the Wrath of God against themselves, about their *own* sinne.

2 That this *worme* never *dyes*, that this *fire* can never be *quenched*, but abides for ever, is also from the *relation* of punishment to a *finite* creature, that is *no* more. Eternity is not *absolutely* in the curse of the Law, but as a *finite* creature is curled thereby. If a sinner could at *once* admit upon himselfe that which is *equall* in divine justice to his offence, and so make *satisfaction*, there might be an end of his punishment in *time*. But a *finite*, and every way limited Creature, having sinned *his eternity* in this World, against an *Eternall* and *infinite* God, must abide by

it for ever. This was Christ *free* from; the *dignity* of his person was such, as that he could fully satisfy divine justice, in a *limited* season; after which, God in *justice loosed the pains* of death, for it was *impossible* he should be detained thereby, *Acts* 2. 24. and that because he was able to *swallow up death into victory*.

§. 27. 2 Punishment, as it relates to the Persons Punished, may be also considered in respect of the effects, which it produceth in them, which are not in the punishment absolutely considered, and these are generally two.

1 *Repining* against God, and *Blaspheming* of him; as in that *type* of Hell, *Isa.* 8. 20. This is evill, or *sin* in *its selfe*, which punishment is not. It is from the *righteous* God, who will doe no iniquity. This proceeds from mens hatred of God; They *hate* him in this world, when he doth them good; and blesses them with many mercies; how much more will their *hatred* be increased, when they shall be *cut off from all favour* or mercy whatever; and never enjoy one drop of refreshment from him. They hate *him*, his *justice*, yea his *blessednesse*, and all his perfections; Hence they *murmure*, *repine*, and *blaspheme* him; Now this must needs be infinitely remote from him, who in *love* to his Father, and his fathers Glory, underwent this punishment; He was *loved* of the Father, and loved him, and willingly dranke of this Cup, which poysons the souls of Sinners with wrath and revenge.

2. *Despaire* in themselves; their hopes being cut off to *eternity*, there remaining no more *sacrifice* for sinne, they are their own tormentors with everlastingly perplexing despaire: But this our Saviour was most remote from; and that because he *believed* he should have a glorious issue of the triall he underwent, *Heb.* 12. 2. *Isa.* 50. 8.

§. 28. But as to the punishment that is threatned in the Law, in it selfe considered, Christ underwent the *same* that the Law *threatned*, and which we should have undergone. For

1. The Law threatned *death*, *Gen.* 3. 15. *Ezek.* 18. 4. and he *tasted death* for us, *Heb* 2. 9. *Psal.* 22. 7, 8. The punishment of the Law is the *curse*, *Deut.* 27. 29. and he was made a *curse*, *Gal.* 3. 13. The Law threatned *losse of the Love and the favour of God*, and he *lost* it, *Psal.* 22. 1.

To say that the death *threatned* by the *Law* was *one*, and that Christ underwent *another*, that Eternall, *this* Temporall, and so

so also of the *curse*, & desertion threatned, (besides what shall be said afterward) would render the whole businesse of our Salvation *unintelligible*, as being revealed in termes equivocall no where explained.

2. There is not the least *intimation* in the whole book of God, of any *change* of the punishment, in reference to the *surety* from what it was, or should have been, in respect of the *sinner*. God made all *our iniquities to meet on him*; that is, (as hath been declared) the *punishment* due to them. Was it the same punishment or another? Did we deserve one punishment, and Christ undergoe another? Was it the sentence of the Law, that was executed on him, or was it some other thing, that he was obnoxious to? It is said, that he was *made under the Law*, *Gal.* 4. 4. that sin was *condemned in his flesh*, Ro. 8. 3. that *God spared him not* Ro. 8. 31. that he *tasted death*; that he was *made a curse*; all relating to the Law: that he suffered more or lesse there is no mention.

It is strange to me, that we should deserve *one* punishment, and he who is punished for us, undergoe *another*; yet both of them be constantly described by the same *names*, and Titles. If God laid the punishment of our sinnes on Christ, certainely it was the punishment that was due to them; mention is every where made of a *commutation* of Persons, the *just* suffering for the unjust, the *sponsor* for the *offender*, his name as a *surety* being taken into the *obligation*, and the whole debt required of him; but of a *change* of punishment, there is no mention at all. And there is this desperate consequence that will be made readily, upon a supposall that any lesse then the *curse* of the Law and death, in the nature of it *eternall*, was inflicted on Christ, namely, that God indeed is not *such a sore revenger of sinne*, as in the Scripture he is proposed to be; but can passe it by in the way of composition on much easier termes.

3. The punishment due to us, that is in the *curse of the Law*, consists (as was said,) of two parts. §. 29.

1. *Losse*, or separation from God.

2. *Sence*, from the infliction of the evill threatned; and both these did our Saviour undergoe.

For the first, it is expressed of him, *Psal.* 22. 1. and he actually complaines of it himselfe, *Matth.* 27. 46. and of this cry for a while, he sayes, *O my God, I cry in the day time and thou hearest not*

Psal 22.2. untill he gives out that grievous complaint, *v*, 15. *My strength is dryed up like a potsherd*; Which cry he pressed so long with strong cryes and supplications, untill he was *heard and delivered from what he feared*, *Heb.* 5. 7. They who would invent evasions for this expresse complaint of our Saviour, that he was deserted and forsaken, as that he spake it in reference to his Church, or of his own being left to the power and malice of the Jewes, do indeed little lesse then *blaspheme* him; and say he was not forsaken of God, when himselfe complaines that he was. *Forsaken* I say, not by the *disjunction* of his personall union; but as to the communication of effects of love and favour, which is the desertion that the damned lye under in Hell. And for his being forsaken, or given up to the hands of men, was that *it*, which he complained of? was that it whereof he was afraid? which he was troubled at? which he sweat blood under the consideration of? and had need of an *Angell* to comfort and support him? Was he so much in courage and resolution below those many thousands who joyfully suffered the same things for him? If he was only *forsaken* to the power of the *Jewes*; it must be so. Let men take heed how they give *occasion* of blaspheming the holy and blessed name of the Son of God.

Vidi ego dum plaustro per ora vulgi traducitur, illudentem Theologo e Franciscanis, cujus cura mollire ferocitatem animi obstinati. Lucilius ferocitate contumax, dum in patibulum traditus, Monachi solatium aspernatus objectam Crucem aversatur, Christoq; illudit in hæc eadem verba; illi in extremis præ timore imbellis sudor, ego imperterritus morior. Falso sane imperterritum se dixit scelestus homo, quem vidimus dejectum animo, Philosophia uti pessime, cujus se mentiebatur professorem. Erat illi in extremis aspectus ferox & horridus, inquieta mens, anxium quodcunq; loquebatur: & quanquam Philosophicè mori se clamabat identidem, finii se ut brutum nemo negaverit. Antequam rogo subderetur ignis: jussus sacrilegam linguam cultro submittere, negat, neq; exerit, nisi forcipum vi apprehensam carnifex ferro abscindit: non alias vociferatio horridior: diceres mugire ictum Bovem, &c. Hic Lucilii Vanini finis, cui quanta constantia fuerit, probat belluinus in morte clamor. Vidi ego in custodia, vidi in patibulo, videram antequam subiret vincula: flagitiosus in libertate, & voluptatum sectator avidus, in carcere Catholicus, in extremis omni Philosophiæ præsidio destitutus, amens moritur. Gramon. Histor. Gal. lib. 3. ad An. 1619.

ly trembled and quaked, but *roared* with horrour. But let men take heed how they justify the Atheisticall thoughts of men, in asserting our blessed *Redeemer* to have been cast into that miserable and deplorable condition, meerly with the consideration of a *temporary* death, which perhaps the *thieves* that were crucifyed with him did not so much tremble at.

§. 30. 2. For *pœna sensus*: from what hath been spoken it is sufficiently manifest what he underwent on this account. To what hath been delivered before, of his being *bruised, afflicted, broken* of God from *Isa.* 53. although he was taken from *prison, and judgement, or everlasting condemnation*, v. 8. Adde but this one consideration of what is affirmed of him, that he *tasted death* for us *Heb.* 2 9. and this will be cleared. What death was it he tasted? The death that had the curse attending it, *Gal.* 3. 13. He was made a curse; and what death that was himselfe declares, *Mat.* 25. 41. where calling men *accursed*, he crys *goe into everlasting fire*: you that are obnoxious to the Law, goe to the punishment of hell; yea and that curse which he underwent *Gal.* 3. 13. is opposed to the blessing of *Abraham*, *v.* 14. or the blessing promised him, which was doubtlesse life eternall.
And to make it yet more *cleare*, it was by *death* that he delivered us from death, *Heb.* 2. 14, 15. and if he dyed only a temporall death, he delivered us only from temporall death, as a punishment. But he shews us what death he delivered us from, and consequently what death he underwent for us, *John* 8. 51. *He shall never see death*; that is, eternall death, for every *Believer* shall see death temporall.

§. 31. On these considerations it is evident, that the sufferings of Christ in *relation* to the Law, were the *very same* that were threatned to sinners, and which we should have undergone, had not our surety undertaken the worke for us. Neither was there any difference in reference to God the *Judge*, and the sentence of the law, but only this, that the *same Person* who offended, did not suffer: and that those consequences of the *punishment* inflicted, which attend the *offenders* own suffering, could have no place in him; but this being not the maine of my present designe, I shall no farther insist on it.

§. 32. Only I marvell, that any should think to implead this truth of Christs suffering the same that we did, by saying that *Christs*

obligation to punishmeat was *sponsionis propriæ*, ours *violatæ legis*: As though it were the manner how Christ came to be obnoxious to punishment, and not *what punishment* he underwent, that is asserted when we say, that he underwent the *same* that we should have done. But as to say, that Christ became *obnoxious* to punishment the same way that we do, or did, that is, by sinne of his own, is *blasphemy*: so to say he did not upon his own *voluntary* undertaking, undergoe the *same*, is little lesse. It is true, Christ was made sinne for us, had *our sinne* imputed to him, not his own; was obliged to answer for *our fault*, not his own; but he was obliged to answer what we *should have done*: but hereof elsewhere.

CHAP. XXVII.

Of the Covenant between the Father and the Sonne, the Ground and Foundation of this Dispensation of Christs being punished for us, and in our stead.

§. 1. THE fourth thing considerable, is the ground of this dispensation of Christs being *punished* for us, which also hath influence into his whole mediation on our behalfe. This is that *compact, covenant, convention,* and Agreement, that was between the *Father*, and the Sonne, for the accomplishment of the worke of our Redemption by the Mediation of Christ, to the *prayse* of the glorious Grace of God.

The *Will* of the Father, appointing & designing the Son to be the *Head, Husband, Deliverer, and Redeemer* of his *Elect*, his Church, his people, whom he did foreknow, with the *Will* of the *Sonne* voluntarily, freely undertaking that *worke*, and all that was required thereunto, is that *compact* (for in that forme it is proposed in the Scripture) that we treat of.

§. 2. It being so *proposed*, so we *call* it; though there be difficulty in its explication. *Rabbi Ruben* in *Galatinus* sayes of *Isa.* 66. 15. that if the Scripture had not *said* it, it had not been Lawfull to have *said* it, but being *written*, it may be spoken, *in fire, or by fire is the Lord Judged*; for it is not *Sophet*, that is, *Judging*, but

בי באש יהוה נשפט

misphet

mishat, that is, *is judged*: which by some is applied to Christ, and the *fire* he underwent in his suffering. However the *Rule* is safe, that which is *written* may be *spoken*; for, for that end was it written: God in his Word teaching us, how we should speake of him; so it is in this matter.

It is *true*; the *Will* of God the Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost, is but *one*. It is a *Naturall property*, and where there is but *one* Nature, there is but one *Will*: but in respect of their *distinct* personall actings, this Will is appropriated to them respectively; so that the *Will* of the Father, and the *Will* of the Sonne, may be considered in this businesse. Which though *essentially* one and the same, yet in their distinct *personality* it is distinctly considered, as the *Will* of the Father, and the *Will* of the Sonne; Notwithstanding the *unity* of Essence, that is *between* the Father and the Sonne, yet is the work *distinctly* carried on by them, so that the same God *judges*, and becomes *surety*, *satisfyeth*, and is *satisfied*, in these distinct persons. §. 3.

Thus though this Covenant be *Eternall*, and the object of it be that which might *not* have been, and so it hath the nature of the residue of Gods *decrees* in those regards, yet because of this distinct acting of the Will of the Father, & the will of the Son, with regard to each other, it is more then a decree, and hath the proper nature of a *Covenant*, or *Compact*. Hence from the *moment* of it (I speake not of time) there is a new habitude of Will in the Father and Sonne towards each other, that is not in them essentially; I call it *new*, as being in God *freely*, not *naturally*. And hence was the salvation of men before the *Incarnation*, by the undertaking, mediation, and death of Christ. That the Saints under the *Old* Testament were saved by Christ, at present I take for granted. That they were saved by vertue of a meer decree, will not be said. From hence was Christ esteemed to be Incarnate, and to have suffered; or the fruits of his *Incarnation* and *Suffering* could not have been imputed to any: for the *thing* it selfe being denied, the *Effects* of it are not. §. 4.

The Revelation of this Covenant is in the Scripture: not that it was then *constituted*, when it is first *mentioned* in the Promises and Prophesies of Christ, but then first *declared* or revealed. Christ was Declared to be the Sonne of God, by the *Resurrection* from the dead; but he *was* so from Eternity. As in other §. 5.

places

places as shall be evinced, so in *Isa.* 53. is this Covenant mentioned; in which Chapter there is this *Propheticall Scheme*; the *Covenant* between Father and Sonne, which was *past*, is spoken of, as *to come*; and the *sufferings* of Christ, which were *to come*, are spoken of as *past*, as appears to every one that but reads the Chapter. It is also signally ascribed to Christs coming into the World: not *constitutively*, but *declaratively*. It is the greatest folly about such things as these, to suppose them then *done*, when *revealed*, though *revealed* in expressions of *doing* them. These things being premised, I proceed to manifest, how this Covenant is in the Scripture declared.

§. 6. Now this *Convention* or Agreement, as elsewhere, so it is most cleerely expressed, *Heb*: 10. from *Ps.* 40. *Lo! I come to do thy will O God.* And what Will? v. 10. *The Will by which we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Iesus once for all.* The Will of God was, that *Jesus* should be *offered*; and to this End, that we might be *sanctified* and saved: It is called the *offering of the body of Jesus*, in Answer to what was said before, *a body hast thou prepared mee*; or an *humane nature*, by a *Synechdoche*. My *Will*, says God the Father, is, that thou *have a body*, and that that *body be offered* up, and that to this end, that the *Children*, the Elect might be sanctified: Sayes the Sonne to this, *Lo, I am come to do thy Will.* I accept of the Condition, and give up my selfe to the performance of thy Will.

§. 7. To make this more distinctly evident, the nature of such a compact, Agreement, or *convention*, as depends on personall *service*, such as this, may be a little considered.

* *Nec dari quicquam necesse est, ut substantiam capiat obligatio; sed sufficit eos qui negotia gerunt consentire.* Institut. l. 3. de oblig. ex consensu.

There are five things required to the compleat establishing, and accomplishing of such a *compact* & agreement: 1. That there be sundry Persons, *two* at least, namely a Promiser, and undertaker, *agreeing* * *voluntarily* together in Counsell and designe, for the *Accomplishment*, and bringing about some common End, acceptable to them both, so agreeing together; being both to do *somewhat*, that they are not otherwise obliged to doe, there must be some *common* end agreed on by them, wherein they are *delighted*; and if they do not both *voluntarily* agree to what is on each hand incumbent to doe, it is no Covenant or Compact, but an imposition of one upon the other.

§. 8. 2. That the *Person* promising, who is the principall engager

in

in the Covenant, do require *something* at the hand of the *other*, to be done, or undergone, wherein he is *concerned*. He is to prescribe something to him, which is the *Condition*, whereon the Accomplishment of the end aimed at, is to depend.

3. That He *make* to him who doth *undertake*, such Promises, as are necessary for his *supportment* and encouragement, and which may *fully* ballance in his judgement, and esteeme, all that is required of him, or prescribed to him.

4. That upon the *weighing*, and consideration of the *Condition* and *Promise*, the *Duty* and *Reward* prescribed, and ingaged for, as formerly mentioned, the undertaker do *voluntarily* addresse himselfe to the *one*, and expect the Accomplishment of the other.

5. That the Accomplishment of the Condition, being * pleaded by the *undertaker*, and approved by the *Promiser*, the common end originally designed, be brought about and established.

* Ὅπερ ὑπροσέσθην σοι, ἔχεις προσδεκτον; ἔχω. Formula Jur. institut. lib. 3. c. Tollitur. §. *item per: Numerius Nigidius interrogavit Aulum Augerium: Quicquid tibi hodierno die, per Aquilianam stipulationem spopondi, ia ne omne habes acceptum. Respondit Aulus Augerius, habeo, acceptumq; tuli.* ibid.

These five things are required, to the entring into, and compleat Accomplishment of such a Covenant, Convention, or Agreement, as is built on personall Performances: and they are all eminently expressed in the Scripture, to be found in the Compact between the Father and the Sonne, whereof we speake; as upon the consideration of the *severalls* will appeare. §. 9.

On the account of these things, found at least *virtually*, and *effectually*, in this Agreement of the Father and Sonne, we call it a *Covenant*; not with respect to the *Latine* word *Fœdus*, and the precise use of it, but to the Hebrew ברית, and the Greeke διαθήκη, whose signification and use alone is to be attended, in the businesse of any Covenant of God; And in what a large sence they are used, is known to all that understand them, and have made inquirie into their import. The rise of the word *fœdus*, is properly *paganish* and *superstitious*; and the *legall* use of it, strict to a mutuall ingagement upon valuable considerations: The forme of its entrance, by the *Sacrifice* and *killing* of a Hogge, is related in *Polybius*, *Livius*, *Virgil*, and others. The generall

words used in it were, * *Ita fœde me percutiat magnus Jupiter, ut fœde hunc porcum macto, si pactum fœderis non servavero.* whence is that phrase of one in danger; *sto inter sacrum & saxum.* The *Hog* being killed with a *stone*; so *fœdus* is *a feriendo.*

* *Fecialis sumpto in manibus lapide, postquam de fœdere inter partes convenerat, hæc verba dixit, Si recte ac sine dolo malo, hoc fœdus atq; hoc jusjurandum facio, dii mihi cuncti felicia præstent; sin aliter aut ago, aut cogito, cæteris omnibus salvis, in propriis legibus, in propriis laribus, in propriis templis, in propriis sepulchris, solus ego peream, ut hic lapis de manibus meis decidet.* Polyb. lib. 3. *Audi Jupiter, audi pater patrate, ut illa palam prima postrema, ex illis tabulis recitata sunt sine dolo malo, utq; ea his hodie rectissime intellecta sunt: illis legibus populus Romanus prior non deficiet: si prior defecerit publico consilio, dolo malo, tu ille Dispiter, populum Romanum sic ferito, ut ego hunc porcum hodie feriam; tanto; magis ferito, quanto magis potes, pollesq; ubi dixit, porcum saxo silice percussit* Livius.

Armati, Jovis ante aram, pateraſq; tenentes,
Stabant, & cæsâ jungebant fœdera porca. Virgil Æneid. lib. 8. *Ad quem locum* Servius: *fœdera dicta sunt, à porca fœde & crudeliter occisa: nam cum ante gladiis configeretur, a fecialibus inventum, ut silice feriretur, ea causa quod antiquum Jovis signum, lapidis silicem putaverunt esse.*

Though sometimes even that *word* be used in a very large sence, for any orderly disposed Government: as in the Poet:

Virg. Æneid. 1. ----- *Regemq; dedit qui fœdere certo*
Et premere, & laxas sciret dare jussus habenas, &c. But unto the signification and Laws hereof, in this business, we are not bound: it sufficeth for our present intendment, that the things mentioned, be found *virtually* in this compact, which they are.

§. 10. 1. There are the *Father* and the *Sonne*, as Distinct Persons agreeing together in Counsell, for the accomplishment of the *common end*; the Glory of God, and the Salvation of the Elect. The end is expressed, *Heb* 2.9,10. *Heb.* 12.1. Now thus it was, *Zech.* 6 13. and the *Counsell of Peace shall be between them both*, *Inter ambos ipsos.* That is the two *Persons* spoken of, not the two *Offices* there intimated, that shall *meet* in Christ; and who are these? The Lord *Jehovah*, who speakes, and the *Man* whose name is צמח the *Branch*, v. 12. who is to *do all the great things* there mentioned. *He shall grow up &c.* But the Counsell of *peace*, the designe of our Peace, is *between them both*: They have agreed and consented to the bringing about of our Peace. Hence is that name of the *Sonne* of God, *Isa.* 9 6. *Wonderfull Counsellour.* It is in reference to the Busines there spoken of, that he is so called. This is expressed at the beginning of the verse: *to us a Child is borne, to us a Sonne is given*; to what end that was, is known;

בין שנהם

known; namely, that he might be a *Saviour* or a *Redeemer*: whence he is afterwards called the *everlasting Father*, *the Prince of peace*; that is, a *Father to his Church* and People, in Everlasting Mercy; the grand Author of their *Peace*, that procured it for them, and established it unto them. Now as to this work, that he who is אלגבור *the mighty God*, might be בן נתן *a sonne given, a child borne*; and carry on a work of *mercy* and *peace* towards his Church, is he called the *wonderfull Counceller*, as concurring in the Counsel and designe of his Father, and *with* him, to this end and purpose. Therefore when he comes to suffer in the carrying on of this work, God calls him his *fellow*, עמיתי, my *Neighbour* in Counsell and advise, as *David* describes his, *fellow* or companion, *Psal.* 55. 14 *We took sweet counsell together.* He was the *fellow* of the Lord of Hosts, on this account that they took *Councell* together about the work of our Salvation to the Glory of God. *Prov.* 8. 22, to 31. makes this evident: that it is the *Lord Jesus Christ*, the Eternall Word, and Wisdome of the Father, who is here intended, was before evinced. What then is here said of him? *I was dayly the delight of God, rejoycing before him, rejoycing in the habitable parts of the Earth, and my delight was in the Sonnes of Men.* When was this, that the *Wisdome* of God the Father did so rejoyce before him, on the account of the *Sonnes of men*, v. 24, 25. *When there was no depths, when there were no fountaines abounding with water, before the Mountains were setled &c. whilest as yet he had not made the Earth, &c.* But how could this be? Namely by the *Counsell* of Peace, that was between them both, which is the Delight of the soule of God, and wherein both *Father* and *Son* rejoyce. Zec. 13. 7.

The first thing then is *manifest*; that there was a *voluntary concurrence*, and distinct consent of the Father and Sonne, for the Accomplishment of the worke of our *peace*, and bringing us to God.

2 For the Accomplishment of this work, the Father who *is principall* in the *Covenant*, the promiser, whose Love *sets all on worke*, as is frequenly expressed in the Scripture, requires of the *Lord Jesus Christ* his Sonne, that he shall *do* that which upon consideration of his *Justice, Glory, and Honour*, was necessary to be done, for the bringing about the end proposed; prescribing §. 11.

to him a Law for the performance thereof; which is called his will so often in Scripture.

What it was that was required, is expressed both *negatively* and positively.

1. *Negatively*, that he should not do, or bring about this work, by any of those *Sacrifices* that had been appointed to make Attonement *suo more*, and to typify out what was by him really to be performed. This the Lord Jesus professeth at the entrance of his work, when he addresses himself to the *doing* of that, which was *indeed* required. *Sacrifice and burnt offerings, &c. thou wouldest not have.* He was not to *offer* any of the Sacrifices that had been offered before, as at large hath been recounted: it was the will of God that by them, He, & what he was to do, should be *shaddowed* out & represented; whereupon, at his comming to his worke, they were all to be *abrogated*. Nor was He to bring *silver or gold* for our Redemption, according to the contrivance of the poore convinced *sinner*, *Mic.* 7. 6. but he was to tender *God* another manner of price, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18.

§. 12. He was to do that which the old Sacrifices could not do, as hath been declared. *For it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sinnes*, Heb. 10. 5. ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας, *quod supra* ἀθετεῖν & ἀναιρεῖσθαι *est extinguere peccata, sive facere ne ultra peccetur; id sanguis Christi facit, tum quia fidem in nobis parit, tum quia Christo jus dat nobis auxilia necessaria impetrandi. Grot in Loc.* Falsely and *injuriously* to the blood of Christ. ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας, is no where in the Scripture, to cause, men to *cease to sinne*; it never respects *properly* what is to *come*, but what is *past*. The Apostle treats not of *Sanctification*, but of *Justification*. The taking away of sins he insists on, is such; as that the sinner should no more be troubled in *conscience* for the *guilt* of them: v. 2. The *typicall* taking away of sinnes by Sacrifices, was by making *Attonement* with God *principally*, not by *turning* men from sinne, which yet was a consequent of them. The blood of Christ takes away sin, as to their guilt, by justification, & not only as to their filthby Sanctification. This *purification* also by blood, He expounds in his Annotations *C.* 9. *v.* 14. *Sanguini autem purgatio ista tribuitur, quia per sanguinem, id est, mortem Christi, secuta ejus excitatione, & evectione, gignitur in nobis fides, Rom.* 3. 25. *quæ deinde fides corda purgat. Act.* 15. 19. The meaning of these words is evident to all that have their sences

sences exercised in these things. The eversion of the *Expiation* of our sinnes, by the way of *Satisfaction* and attonement, is that which is aymed at. Now because the *Annotatour* saw, that the comparison insisted on with the Sacrifices of old, would not admit of this glosse: He addes: *Similitudo autem purgationis legalis, & evangelicæ, non est in modo purgandi, sed in effectu.* Then which nothing is more false, nor more directly contrary to the Apostles discourse, *chap.* 9, 10.

2. *Positively*, and here, to lay aside the *manner* how he was to do it, which relates to his Office of *Priest*, and *Prophet*, and *King*, the conditions imposed upon him may be referred to three Heads. §. 13.

1. That he should take on him the nature of those, whom he was to bring to God. This is as it were prescribed to him, *Heb.* 10.5. *a body hast thou prepared me*; or *appointed* that I should be made *flesh*, take a *body* therein to do thy will. And the Apostle sets out the infinite Love of the Sonne of God, in that he condescended to this inexpressible *exinanition*, and eclipsing of his Glory, *Phil.* 2.6,7. *being in the forme of God*, and equall to God, he made himselfe of no reputation, but tooke upon him the *forme* of a Servant, and was made in the *likenesse* of man; or made a man. He did it upon his Fathers *prescription*, and in pursuit of what God required at his hands. Hence it is said, *God sent forth his Sonne, made of a woman*, Gal. 4.4. and *God sent his own Sonne in the likenesse of sinfull flesh*, *Rom.* 8. 3. and properly in answer to this of the Fathers appointing him a *body*, is it that the Sonne answers, *Loe! I come to do thy will.* I will do it, I will undertake it; that the *great desirable* end may be brought about, as we shall see afterwards. So *Heb.* 2.14,15. And though I see no sufficient reason of relinquishing the usuall interpretation of σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται *Heb.* 2.16. yet if it be *apprehendit*, and expressive of the effect; not *assumpsit*, relating to the way of his yeilding us *assistance* and *deliverance*, the same thing is intimated. §. 14.

2. That in this *body* or humane nature, he should be a *Servant* or yeild obedience; hence God calls him his Servant, *Isa.* 42. 1. *Behold my Servant whom I uphold*; & that this was also in the condition prescribed to him, our Saviour acknowledges, *Isa.* 49.5. *Now saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his Servant*; §. 15.

And in pursuit hereof, Christ takes upon him the *forme of a servant Phil.* 2. 6. and this is his perpetuall profession, *I come to do the will of him that sent me.*

And this commandemenet I have received of my Father. So though he was a Son, yet *learned he obedience.* All along in the carrying on of his worke he professes that this condition was by his *Father prescribed him*, that he should be his Servant, and yeild him obedience, in the worke he had in hand. Hence he saies, his Father *is greater then he*, not only in respect of his humiliation but also in respect of the dispensation whereunto he as the *Son of God*, submitted himselfe to performe his *Will*, and yeild him obedience. And this God declares to be the conditiou whereon he will deliver man. Job 33. 23. if *there be a messenger* (a servant) *one of a thousand to undertake* for him, it shall be so, I will say, *deliver man*; otherwise not.

Joh. 14. 28.

Vid. Coccei-um in locum.

§. 16. 3. That he should suffer and undergoe what in Justice is due to Him, that he was to deliver; A *hard* and great prescription: yet such as must be *undergone*, that there may be a consistence of the *Justice* and Truth of God, with the *Salvation* of man. This is plainely expressed *Is.* 53 10. *When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin*, or rather *if his soul shall make an offering for sin, then he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.* As if he should say, if this *worke* be brought about, and if the *Counsell of peace* which we have consented in, be carryed on, if my pleasure therein be to *prosper*, thou must make thy soule an *offering* for sinne. And that this was required of our Saviour, himselfe fully expresses even in his *Agony*, when praying for the removall of the *cup*, He submits to the drinking of it, in these words: *thy will O Father be done*; this is that, which thou *wilt* have me doe; which thou hast *prescribed* unto me, even that I *drink of this cup*, wherein he *tasted of death*, and which comprised the whole of his suffering; and this is the third thing in this *Convention* and Agreement.

אם תשים אשם נפשו

§. 17. 4. Promises are made upon the supposition of undertaking that which was required; and these of all *sorts*, that might either concerne the *person* that did undertake, or the Accomplishment of the *worke* that he did undertake.

1. For the *Person* himselfe that was to undertake, or the Lord Jesus Christ, seeing there was much difficulty, and great opposition

oppositon to be passed through, in what he was to do, and undergoe; Promises of the Assistance of his Father by his presence with him, & *carrying* him through all perplexities and tryalls, are given to him in abundance. Some of these you have Isa. 42.4. *He shall not faint, nor be discouraged, untill he hath set judgement in the earth.* And *v.6. I the Lord have called thee in Righteousnesse, and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee, and give thee a Covenant of the People.* What ever opposition thou mayst meet withall, I will *hold* thee, and *keep* thee, and *preserve* thee, I will not leave thy soule in Hell, nor suffer thine *holy* one to see corruption *Psal.*16 3. So *Psal.*89.28 *My mercy will I keep for him evermore, & my Covenant shall stand fast with him.* And hence was our blessed Saviours confidence in his greatest tryall. *Isa.* 50. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. *v.*5,6. our Saviour expresses his *undertaking*; & what he *suffered* herein *v.*7,8, 9. The assistance that he was promised of his Father in this great tryall, on the account whereof he despises all his Enemies, with full Assurance of *successe*: even upon the Fathers ingaged *promise*, of his presence with him. This is the first sort of promises made to Christ in this Convention, which concerne himselfe directly; that he should not be forsaken in his worke, but carryed through, supported, and upheld, untill he were come forth to *full successe*, and had sent *forth judgement into victory.* Hence in his greatest *tryall*, he makes his addresse to God himselfe, on the account of these promises, to be delivered from that *which he feared*, Heb. 5.7. Who in the dayes &c. So *Psal.*89.27,28.

2. There were *promises* in this compact, that concerned the *worke* it selfe, that Christ undertook; namely, that if he did what was required of him, not only that he should be perserved in it, but also, that the worke it selfe should thrive and prosper in his hand. So *Isa.* 53. 10, 11. *When thou shalt make &c.* What ever he aymed at is here promised to be accomplished; the *pleasure* of the Lord shall prosper: the designe of Father and Sone, for the accomplishment of *our Salvation*, shall prosper: He shall *see his seed*, a seed of Believers shall be raised up, that shall *prolong their dayes*: that is, the seed shall prolong, or *continue* whiles the Sunne and Moone indures: all the Elect shall be *Justifyed and Saved. Sathan* shall be conquered, and the *Spoile* delivered from him. And this our Saviour comforts himselfe withall *§. 18.*

withall in his *greatest distresse*, Psal. 22. 30, 31. and for this glory that *was set before him*, the glory of *bringing many Sons to glory* that was promised to him, *He despised the shame, and endured the Crosse*, Heb 12. 2. So also Isa. 42. 1, 2.

And this is the 3 thing in this compact, he who prescribes the hard Conditions of *Incarnation*, *obedience*, & *death*, doth also make the *glorious promises* of *Preservation*, *Protection*, and *Successe*. And to make these promises the more eminent, God confirmes them solemnely by an Oath; he is consecrated an High Priest for evermore by the *word of the oath*, Heb. 7. 28. *The Lord swear and will not repent, thou art a Priest for ever, &c.*

§. 19. 4. The Lord Jesus Christ accepts of the *Condition*, and the *Promise*, and *voluntarily* undertakes the worke. *Psal.* 40. 7, 8. *Then said I, loe! I come to do thy will, yea I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea thy Law is within my heart.* He freely, willingly, cheerfully, undertakes to do, and suffer whatever it was the will of his Father, that he should do, or suffer, for the bringing about the *common end* aymed at; He undertakes to be the *Fathers servant* in this worke: And sayes to the Lord, *thou art my Lord*, *Psal.* 16. 2. thou art *He*, to whom I am to *yeild* obedience, to submit to thee in this worke. *Mine eare hast thou bored, and I am thy Servant.* I am not *Rebellious*, I do not withdraw from it, *Isa.* 50. 8. Hence the Apostle tels us, that this *mind* was in Him; that whereas he was in the *forme of God*, he humbled himselfe to the death of the crosse, *Phil.* 2. 8: and so by his *own voluntary consent* he came under the Law of the Mediatour, which afterwards as he *would* not, so he *could* not decline. He made himselfe *surety* of the Covenant, and so was to pay what he never tooke. He *voluntarily* ingaged himselfe into this *sponsion*; but when he had so done, he was *legally* subject to all that attended it; when he had put his *name* into the *Obligation*, he became responsible for the whole debt, and all that he did, or suffered comes to be called *Obedience*, which relates to the Law that he was subject to: having engaged himselfe to his father, and said to the Lord, *thou art my Lord, loe! I come to do thy will.*

§. 20. 5. The fifth and last thing is, that on the *one side*, the *promiser* do approve & accept of the performance of the condition prescribed, and the *Undertaker demand*, and lay clayme to the *promises* made, and thereupon the *common end* designed be accomplished

pliſhed and fulfilled. All this alſo is fully manifeſt, in this *Compact* or *Convention*. God the Father he accepts of the performance of what was to the Sonne preſcribed. This God fully declares Iſa. 49. 5, 6. *And now ſayth the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his ſervant, to bring Jacob againe to him, though Iſrael be not gathered, yet ſhall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God ſhall be my ſtrength: And he ſaid, it is a light thing that thou ſhouldſt be my ſervant to rayſe up the tribes of Jacob, and to reſtore the preſerved of Iſrael: I will alſo give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou maiſt be my Salvation to the ends of the earth.* And eminently v. 8, 9. *Thus ſaith the Lord, in an acceptable time have I heard thee: and in a day of Salvation have I helped thee and I will preſerve thee & give thee for a Covenant of the people, to eſtabliſh the earth to cauſe to inherit the deſſolate heritages. That thou mayſt ſay to the priſoners go forth; to them that are in darkenes ſhew your ſelves, &c.* Now I have bin with thee & *helped* thee in thy work & thou haſt performed it, now thou ſhalt do al that thy heart deſires, according to my promiſe. Hence that which was *originally* ſpoken of the *Eternall generation* of the Son *Pſ.* 2. 7. *Thou art my Sonne this day have I begotten thee,* is applyed by the Apoſtle to his Reſurrection from the dead. Act. 13. 33. *God hath fulfilled his word unto us, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus from the dead,* as it is alſo writen in the 2 Pſal. *Thou art my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee.* That is, God by the Reſurrection from the dead, glorioufly manifeſted him to be his Son, whom he *Loved*, in whom he was well pleaſed, and who did all his pleaſure. So Rom. 1. 4. *He was declared to be the Sonne of God with power, by the Reſurrection from the dead.* Then was he declared to be the Son of God. God approving and accepting the worke he had done, *looſed the paines of death*, and raiſed him againe, manifeſting to all the world his approbation and acceptation of him and his worke. Whence he immediately ſayes to him, Pſal. 2. 8. *Aske of me, and I will give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance: now aske* what thou wilt, what ever I have promiſed, what ever thou didſt, or couldeſt expect upon thy undertaking this worke, it ſhall de done, it ſhall be granted thee. And

2. Chriſt accordingly makes his demand *ſolemnly* on Earth, and in Heaven; On earth *Ioh.* 17. throughout; the whole Chapter is the Demand of Chriſt, for the Accompliſhment of the whole Compact, and all the Promiſes that were made to Him, §. 21.

when he undertook to be a *Saviour*, both which concerned himselfe and his Church; see v. 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. &c. and in Heaven also; He is *gone into the presence* of God, there to *appeare for us*, *Heb.* 9. 24. and is able to *save to the uttermost them that come to God by him, seeing he liveth for ever, to make intercession for them*, *Heb.* 7. 25. not as in the daies of his flesh, with strong *cryes* and supplications, but by vertue of his *Oblation*, laying claime to the promised Inheritance in our behalfe. And,

§. 22. 3 The whole work is Accomplished, and the end intended brought about; For in the Death of Christ he *finished the Transgression, and made an end of sinne, and made Reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting Righteousnesse*, *Dan.* 9. 24. and of *sinfull* man. God saies, deliver him, *for I have found a Ransome*, *Job.* 33. 24. Hence our Reconciliation, Justification, yea our salvation, are in the Scripture spoken of, as things *actually* done and accomplished, in the *death*, and *blood-shedding* of Jesus Christ: not as though we were all then *actually* justified and saved, but upon the account of the certainty of the *performance*, and accomplishment of those things in their *due* time towards us, and upon us, are these things so delivered: for in *reference* to the undertaking of Christ in this *Covenant*, is he called the *second Adam*, becoming a *common head* to his people, with this difference; that *Adam* was a *common head* to all that came of him, *necessarily*, and as I may so say, *naturally* and whether he would or no; Christ is so to his, *voluntarily*, and by his *own consent* and undertaking, as hath been demonstrated; now as we all dye in *Adam fœderally* and *meritoriously*, yet the severall *individualls* are not in their persons actually *dead* in sinne, and *obnoxious* to eternall death, before they are by naturall Generation united to *Adam*, their first head; So though all the Elect be *made alive*, and *saved fœderally* and *meritoriously* in the Death of Christ, wherein also a *certain* foundation is laid of that efficacy, which workes all these things in us, and for us, yet we are not *viritim* made partakers of the good things mentioned, before we are *united* to Christ, by the communication of his spirit to us.

§. 23. And this I say is the *Covenant* and Compact, that was between Father and Sonne, which is the great foundation of what hath been said, and shall farther be spoken, about the *merit* and *Satisfaction* of Christ; here lyes the ground of the Righteousnesse

teousnesse of the dispensation treated of: That Christ should undergoe the *punishment* due to us, it was done *voluntarily* of himselfe; and he did nothing but what he had *power* to doe, and *command* from his Father to doe; *I have power*, saith he, *to lay downe my life, and Power to take it againe, this command have I received of my Father*; whereby the glory both of the Love, and justice of God is exceedingly exalted. And,

1. This stops the mouth of the *Socinian* clamour, concerning the Unrighteousnesse of *one mans* suffering *personally*, for another mans sinne. It is true, it is so; if *these* men be not in such Relation to one another, that what *one* doth, or *suffereth*, the other may be accounted to *do*, or suffer; but it is no *unrighteousnesse*, if the *hand offend*, that the *head* be smitten; but Christ is our *head*, we are his *members*. It is true; if he that *suffereth* hath not power over that wherein he *suffers*; but Christ had power to *lay down his life*, and take it againe. It is true, if he that is to *suffer*, or he that is to *punish*, be not *willing*, or agreed to the commutation: But here *Father* and *Sonne* as hath been manifested, were fully agreed upon the whole matter. It may be true; if he who suffers cannot possibly be made *partaker* of any good *afterward*, that shall ballance, and overweigh all his suffering; not, where the Crosse is endured, and the *shame* despised, for the *Glory* proposed, or set before him, that suffers: not, where he is made *Low for a season*, that he may be *Crowned* with Dignity and Honour. And,

2. This is the foundation of the *merit* of Christ. The Apostle tells us, *Rom.* 4. 4. what *merit* is: it is such an adjunct of *obedience*, as whereby the Reward is reckoned, not of Grace, but of debt. God having proposed a *Law* for *obedience* unto Christ, with Promises of such and such Rewards, upon condition of fulfilling the obedience required: He performing that *obedience*, the Reward is *reckoned* to him *of debt*, or he *righteously* merited what ever was so promised to him. Though the *compact* was of *grace*, yet the *reward* is of *debt*. Look then what ever God promised Christ, upon his *undertaking* to be a Saviour, that, upon the fulfilling of his Will, he merited: that himselfe should be *exalted*, that he should be the *Head* of his *Church*, that he should *see his seed*, that he should *justify* and save them, *sanctify* and *glo-* §. 24.

rify them, was all promised to him; all *merited* by him. But of this more afterwards.

§. 25. Having thus fully considered the three fold notion of the death of Christ, as it was a *Price*, a *Sacrifice*, and a *Punishment*, and discovered the foundation of Righteousnesse in all this, Proceed we now to manifest, what are the Proper Effects of the Death of Christ, under this three fold Notion; now these also answerably are Three.

1. *Redemption* as it is a *Price*.
2. *Reconciliation* as it is a *Sacrifice*.
3. *Satisfaction* as it is a *punishment*. Upon which foundation, Union with Christ, Vocation, Justification, Sanctification, and Glory are built.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Of Redemption by the Death of Christ, as it was a Price or Ransome.

§. 1. HAving given before the Generall *Notions* of the Death of Christ, as it is in Scripture proposed, all tending to manifest the *way*, and manner of the *Expiation* of our sinnes, and our delivery from the Guilt, and Punishment due to *them*, it remains, that an Accommodation of those severall Notions of it, be *made* particularly, and respectively, to the businesse in hand.

§. 2. The first consideration proposed of the Death of Christ, was of it, as a *Price*; and the issue and effect thereof, is *Redemption*. Hence Christ is spoken of in the *Old* Testament as a *Redeemer*, *Job*. 19. 25. *I know that my* Redeemer *lives*; the word there used is גואל whose rise and use is commonly known.

גאל is *vindicare*, *redimere*, as ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι in Greek which is commonly used for *suum vindicare*: ὅτι ἄν τις κεκλημένος ᾖ, καὶ μηδεὶς ἐπιλάβηται, ἐὰν οὕτω τὸ ἐνιαυτὸν ὁτιοῦν κεκλημένοις------μὴ ἐξέστω τοιούτου κτήματος ἐπιλάβεσθαι μηδὲν ἀπελθόντος ἐνιαυτοῦ. *Plato de Legib.* 12. And that may be the sence of the word ἐπιλάβετο, if not in the *effect*, yet in the *cause*, *Heb.* 2. 16.

The

The *rise* and use of this word, in this business of our deliverance by Christ, we have *Levit.* 25. 25. if any of his Kin come to redeeme it. גאלו הקרב *redimens illud propinquus*; the *next* who is *goel* too, *redeeme* it, or vindicate the possession out of Morgage On this account *Boaz* tells *Ruth*, that in respect of the possession of *Elimelech*, he was *Goel*, *Ruth*. 3. 13. *a Redeemer*, which we have translated, a *Kinsman*, because he was to doe that office by right of *propinquity* of blood, or neerenesse of *Kin*; as is evident from the Law before mentioned. Christ coming to vindicate us into liberty, by his own blood, is called by *Job* his *goel*; so also is he termed, *Isa* 41. 14. גאלך thy *Redeemer*, or thy next Kinsman; and Chap. 44. 6. in that Excellent description of Christ, v. 24. c. 46. 4. Chap. 48. 17. C. 49. 26. C. 54. 5. C. 59. 20. C. 60. 16. C. 63. 16. and in sundry other places; Neither is the Church of God at all beholding to some *late* Expositors, who to shew their skill in the *Hebrew* Doctors, would impose upon us their *Interpretations*, and make those expressions to signify *deliverance* in generall, and to be referred to *God the Father*, seeing that the *rise* of the *use* of the word plainly restrains the *redemption* intended, to the *paying* of a *Price* for it, which was done only by Jesus Christ; so *Jerem.* 32. 7, 8. Hence they that looked for the *Messiah*, according to the promise, are said to look for, or to wait for λύτρωσιν, *Redemption in Israel*, *Luk.* 2. 28. and in the Accomplishment of the promise, the Apostle tells us, that Christ by his blood *obtained for us eternall Redemption*, *Heb.* 9. 12. and he having so obtained it, we are justified *freely by the grace of* God, διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, by the *redemption that is in Jesus Christ*, ἐν for διὰ, in him, for, by him, or wrought by him: And this being brought home to us, we have *redemption through his blood*, even the forgivenesse of sinne, *Eph.* 1. 7. *Col.* 1. 14. whence he is said to be *made unto us*, ἀπολύτρωσις, or *Redemption*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 30.

How this is done, will be made evident, by applying of what is now spoken, to what was spoken of the Death of Christ, as a *Price*; Christ giving *himselfe* or his *life*, λύτρον and ἀντίλυτρον, a *Price of redemption*, as hath been shewed, a *ransome*; those for whom he did it, become to have λύτρωσιν and ἀπολύτρωσιν, *redemption* thereby, or *deliverance* from the Captivity wherein they were. And our Saviour expresses particularly, how this was §. 4.

done as to both parts, *Math.*20. 28. He came δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, that is, *he came to be an* ἀντίψυχον, one to stand in the roome of others, and to give his life for them.

§. 5. To make this the more evident and cleare, I shall give a description of Redemption *properly* so called, and make Application of it in the severall parts thereof, unto that under consideration.

Redemption is the deliverance of any one from bondage or captivity, and the misery attending that condition, by the intervention or interposition of a Price or Ransome, paid by the Redeemer, to him by whose Authority He is detained, that being delivered, he may be in a state of liberty, at the disposall of the Redeemer.

And this will comprise the Laws of this Redemption, which are usually given. They are on the part of the *Redeemer.*

1. *Propinquus esto*, Let him be neare of Kin.

2. *Consanguinitatis jure redimito*, Let him redeeme by right of Consanguinity.

3. *Injusto possessori prædam eripito*; Let him deliver the Prey from the unjust possessor.

4. *Huic pretium nullum solvito*; to him let no price be paid.

5. *Sanguinem pro redemptionis pretio vero domino offerto*; Let him offer, or give his blood to the true Lord for a ransome, or price of Redemption.

2. On the part of the Redeemed.

1. *Libertatis jure felix gaudeto*; Let him enjoy his liberty.

2. *Servitutis jugum ne iterum sponte suscipito*; Let him not again willingly take on him the yoke of Bondage.

3. *Deinceps servum se exhibeto Redemptori*; let him in liberty be a Servant to his Redeemer.

§. 6. The generall parts of this description of *Redemption*, *Socinus* himselfe consents unto: for whereas *Covet* had a little inconveniently defined *to redeeme*, saying, *Redimere aliquem est debitum solvere creditori ejus nomine, qui solvendo non erat, s. & satisfacere creditori*: which is a proper description of the *payment of another mans debt*, and not of his Redemption; *Socinus* correcting this mistake, affirmes, that, *Redimere aliquem, nihil aliud propriè significat, quam Captivum e manibus illius qui eum detinet pretio illi dato liberare.* "To redeeme any one properly, signifies nothing else, but to deliver him out of his hands

"hands that detained him Captive, by a Price given to "him who detained him. Which as to the generall nature of Redemption, contains as much as what was before given in for the description of it; (*Socin. de Jes. Christo Servatore lib.* 1. *Part.* 2. *Cap.* 1.) With the accommodation therefore of that description to the *Redemption* which we have by the *blood* of Christ, I shall proceed; Desiring the Reader to remember, that if I evince the Redemption we have by Christ to be *proper*, and *properly* so called, the whole businesse of satisfaction is *confessedly* evinced.

§. 7. 1 The generall *Nature* of it consists in *deliverance*; thence Christ is called ὁ ῥυόμενος, the *deliverer*; *Rom* 11.26. as it is written, *there shall come out of Sion the deliverer*; The word in the Prophet, *Isa.* 59.20. is גואל that we may know what kind of *deliverer* Christ is; A deliverer by *Redemption*: He gave himselfe for our sinne, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς, *Gal.* 1.4. that he might *deliver* us; He delivered us; but it is by *giving himselfe for our sin*, 1 *Thes.* 1.10. *To wait for his Son from Heaven, whom he raised from the dead,* Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς ἐρχομένης, *Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come*, so *Luk.* 1.74. *Rom.* 7.6. *Heb.* 2.15. *Col.* 1.13.

§. 8. Now as Redemption, because its generall Nature consists in Deliverance, is often expressed thereby; so *deliverance*, because it hath the Effect of Redemption, *is*, or *may* be called Redemption, though it be not properly so, but agree in the *End*, and Effect only: thence *Moses* is said to be λυτρωτὴς, *Acts* 7.35. τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέσταλκεν· *Him did God send a Prince, and a Redeemer*: that is, a Deliverer; one whom God used for the Deliverance of his People. And because what he *did*, even the Delivery of his People out of Bondage, agreed with Redemption, in it's *end*, the Work its selfe is called Redemption, and He is termed therein a Redeemer, though it was not a *direct* Redemption that he wrought; no Ransome being paid for delivery.

It is *pleaded*, that God being said to *redeeme* his people in sundry places in the Old Testament, which he could not possibly do, by a Ransome, therefore the Redemption mentioned in the Scripture, is Metaphoricall: a meere deliverance: & such is also that we have by Christ without the intervention of any *Price*.

2. *Moses*,

2. *Moses* who was a *Type* of Christ, and a Redeemer, who is so often said to redeeme the people, yet as it is *known*, did it without any *Ransome*, by a meere deliverance; therefore did Christ so also.

Not to trouble the Reader with repetition of words, this is the summe of what is pleaded by the *Racovian Catechisme* to prove our *Redemption by Christ*, not to be *proper*, but *Metaphorical*, & so consequently that no *Satisfaction* can be thence evinced. *E verbo redimendi non posse effici satisfactionem hanc hinc est planum, quod de ipso Deo in novo & in prisco fœdere scribitur, eum redimisse populum suum ex Egypto, eum feciste redemptionem populo suo: quod Moses fuerit Redemptor*, Act. 7. 35. *Vox ideo Redemptionis, simpliciter liberationem denotat.* Rac. Catec. cap. 8. de Christo.

And indeed what there they speake is the summe of the plea of *Socinus* as to this part of our description of Redemption: *de Jesu Christo Servatore, Lib. 1. Part. 2 Cap. 1,2,3.*

To remove these *difficulties* (if they may be so called) I shall only tender the ensuing considerations.

§. 10. 1. That because Redemption is sometime to be taken *Metaphorically* for meere deliverance, when it is spoken of God without any mention of a Price or Ransome, in such *cases* as wherein it was impossible that a *Ransome* should be paid Deut. 4. 34. (as in the *deliverance of the Childrem of Israel from Ægypt*, & *Pharaoh*,) when it is expresly said to be done by *power*, and *outstretched arme*, therefore it must be so understood, when it is spoken of Christ the *Mediatour*, with expresse *mention of a price* or Ransome, & when it was *impossible* but that a *ransome* must be paid, is a loose consequence, not deserving any notice.

§. 11. 2. That all the places of Scripture, where mention is made of God being a *Redeemer*, and *Redeeming* his people, may be referred unto these heads.

1. Such as call God the Redeemer of his Church in generall, as the places before mentioned; and these are all to be referred immediately to the *Sonne* of God, (the manner of his Redemption being described in the *New Testament*) and so proper *Redemption* is intended in them. *Is.* 54. 5,6. with *Ep.* 5. 25 26.

2. Such as mention some temporall deliverance, that was Typicall of the *Spirituall Redemption*, which we have by Jesus Christ; and it is called *Redmption*, not so much from the generall

rall nature of *deliverance*, as from its *pointing* out to us that *reall* and *proper* Redemption, that was *typifyed* by it. Such was Gods *redeeming* his people out of Ægypt. So there is no mention of Redemption in the Scripture, but either it is proper, or receives that *Apellation* from its Relation to that which is so.

3. This is indeed a very wretched and cursed way of interpreting Scripture, especially those passages of it which set out the *grace* of God, and the *Love* of Christ to us; namely, to do it by way of diminution, and lessening; God takes and uses this word that is of *use* amongst men; namely of *Redemption*: saith he, Christ hath *Redeemed you with his own blood*, he hath layd *down a price for you*; for men to come and interpret this, and say he did it not *properly*, it was not a compleat Redemption, but *Metaphoricall*, a bare *deliverance*, is to Blaspheame God and the worke of his Love and Grace. It is a *safe Rule* of interpreting Scripture, that *in places* mentioning the *Love* and *Grace* of God to us, the words are to be taken in their utmost *significancy*. It is a thing most unworthy a *good* and *wise man*, to set out his kindnesse and benefits with great *swelling words*, of mighty weight and importance, which when the things signifyed by them come to be considered, must be interpreted by way of *minoration*; nor will any worthy man do so. Much lesse can it be once *imagined*, that God has expressed his *Love* and *Kindnesse*, and the fruits of it to us, in great and *weighty* words, that in their ordinary use and significancy, containe a great deale more then really he hath done? for any one so to interpret what he hath spoken, is an Abomination, into which I desire my soule may never enter. §. 12.

What the Redemption of a Captive is, and how it is brought about we know. God tells us, that Christ hath *Redeemed us*, and that with his *owne* blod; is it not better to believe the Lord, and venture our soules upon it, then to goe to God and say, *this thou hast said indeed; but it is an improper and Metaphoricall Redemption, a deliverance that we have.* The truth is, it is so farre from truth, that God hath delivered the worke of his Grace, and our benefit thereby, in the death of Christ, in words too *bigge* in their proper signification for the things themselves, that no words whatever are sufficient to expresse it and convey it to our understandings. §. 13.

§. 14. 4. That *Moses* who was a *Type* of Christ in the worke of *Redemption*, and is called a *Redeemer*, did *redeeme* the People without the proper payment of a valuable Ransome; therefore Christ did so also; to conclude thus, I say, is to say, that the *type*, and things *typified* must in all things be alike; yea, that a similitude between them in that, wherein their *relation* consists, is not enough to maintain their *relation*, but there must be such an *identity* as in truth overthrows it. Christ tells us, that the *Brazen Serpent* was a *type* of him, *John* 3. 14. As *Moses lifted up the brazen Serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up*; Now if a man should thence argue, that because the *Brazen Serpent* was only *lifted up*, not Crucifyed, nor did shed his *blood* therefore Christ was not Crucifyed, nor shed his blood; would he be attended unto? The like may be said of *Jonas*, who was *alive* in the belly of the *Whale*, when he was a *type* of Christ, being dead in the Earth; in the generall nature of *deliverance from Captivity*, there was an agreement in the *corporeall* deliverance of *Moses* and the *spirituall* of Christ, and here was the one a *type* of the other; in the manner of their accomplishment, the one did not represent the other; the one being said *expressly* to be done by *power*, the other by a Ransome.

§. 15. 2. It is the delivery of one in captivity; all men considered in the state of sinne, and alienation from God are in captivity. Hence they are said to be *captives* & *to be bound in prison*, *Isa.* 61. 1. and the worke of Christ is to bring the *prisoners* out of prison, and them that sit in darkenesse, (that is, in the *Dungeon*) out of the *Prison house*, Isa. 42. 7. he sayes to the prisoners *go forth*, to them that are in darkenesse, *shew your selves*, Chap. 49. 9. as it is eminently expressed *Zech*: 9. 11. *As for thee also by the blood of the Covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein there is no water.* Here are prisoners, Prisoners belonging to the *daughter of Sion*, for unto them, the Church, he speakes, v. 9. rejoyce greatly *O daughter of Sion*; those other sheep of the fold of Christ, not yet gathered when this promise was given, are spoken of. And they are in the *pit* wherein there is no *water*; a pit for security to detaine them, that they may not escape: and without water, that they may in it find no *refreshment*. How are these prisoners delivered? By the blood of this Covenant. Of whom he speakes, see v. 9. *Behold thy King cometh unto thee:*

he

he is just, and having Salvation, lowly, and riding upon an Asse, and upon a Colt the foal of an Asse. It is a description of Christ when he rode to *Jerusalem*, to *seale* and confirme the Covenant for the deliverance of the prisoners with his own blood; which is therefore called the blood of the Covenant, with which he was Sanctifyed *Heb.* 10. 29. hence in the next verse, *prisoners of hope* is a description of the Elect *Zec.* 9. 12.

So also are they called *Captives* expressly, *Isa.* 49. 25. *Thus* §. 16.
saith the Lord, even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered; those who were in their *captivity* a prey to Sathan, that mighty and cruell one, shall be delivered; and who shall do this? *The Lord thy Saviour, and thy Redeemer, the Mighty one of Jacob*, v. 26. He proclaimes liberty to the Captives. *Isa.* 61. 1. *Luk.* 4. 18. And this is given in as the great fruit of the *death* of Christ, that upon his conquest of it he led *captivity captive*, Psal. 68. 18. Eph. 4. 8. that is, either captivity actively, Sathan who held and detained *his* in captivity, or passively those who were in captivity to him.

Thus being both Prisoners and Captives they are said to be in Bondage; Christ gives us liberty from that yoak of bondage. *Gal.* 5. 1. and men are in Bondage by reason of *death all their daves*, *Heb.* 2. 14. There is indeed nothing that the Scripture more abounds in, then this, that men in the state of sinne are in Prison, Captivity, & Bondage, are Captives, Prisoners, and Slaves.

Concerning this two things are considerable.

1. The cause of mens Bondage and Captivity, deserving, §. 17.
or procuring it.

2. The efficient principall cause of it, to whom they are in Captivity.

For the first (as it is known) it is sinne. To all this bondage and captivity men are sold by sinne. In this businesse sinne is considered two ways.

1. As a Debt, whereof God is the Creditor. Our Saviour hath taught us to pray for the Forgivenesse of our sinnes under that notion, *Math.* 6. 12. ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, *remit to us our debts*; And in the Parable of the Lord and his Servants, *Math* 18 27, 28. 29. he calls it, τὸ δάνειον, v. 27. and τὸ ὀφειλόμενον, v. 30. *due debt*; all which he expounds by παραπτώματα, v. 35. *offences or transgressions* Debt makes men liable to Prison for

non-payment, and so doth sinne (without satisfaction made) to the Prison of Hell; so our Saviour expresses it, *Math.* 5. 25, 26. *Agree quickly with thine Adversary, whiles thou art in the way with him, least at any time the Adversary deliver thee to the Judge, and the Judge deliver thee to the Officer, and thou be cast into Prison: Verily I say unto thee, thou shalt by no meanes come out thence 'till thou hast paid the utmost farthing.* On this account, 1. Are men Prisoners for sinne: They are bound in the Prison house, because they have wasted the *Goods* of their Master, and contracted a *Debt* that they are no way able to pay: and if it be not paid for them, there they must lye to Eternity. All mankind was cast into Prison, for that Great Debt they contracted in *Adam*, in their *Trustee*; being there, in stead of making any Earnings to pay the Debt already upon them by the Law, they contract more, and increase 10000s of Talents. But this use of the word *Debt* and *Prison*, applyed to *Sin* and *Punishment*, is Metaphoricall.

§. 18. 2. As a Crime, Rebellion, Transgression against God, the great Governour, and Judge of all the World. The *Criminalnesse*, Rebellion, and Transgression, the Disobedience that is in Sinne, is more or lesse expressed by all the words in the *Originall*, whereby any sinnes are signified and called: now for sinne considered as Rebellion, are men cast into Prison, Captivity and Bondage, by way of Judiciall processe & Punishment.

§. 19. 2. For the Principall Cause of this Captivity and Imprisonment, it is God: For

1. He is the Creditor to whom these Debts are due, *Math.* 6. 12. *Our Father which art in Heaven, forgive us our Debts*; It is to him that we stand Indebted the ten thousand Talents; *Against thee only have I sinned*, saies *David*, *Psal.* 51. 4. God hath intrusted us with all we have to sinne *by*, or withall; he hath lent it us, to lay out for his Glory; our spending of what we have received upon our Lusts, is running into Debt unto God; Though he doth not Reap, where he did not Sow, yet he requires his Principall with advantage,

2. And *properly*, He is the great King, Judge, and Governour of the World, who hath given his Law, the Rule of our Obedience; and every transgression thereof is a Rebellion against him: Hence, to sinne, is to *rebell*, and to Transgresse, and to be

be Perverse, to Turne aside from the way, to cast off the Yoke of the Lord, as it is every where expressed. God is the Law-giver, *Jam:* 4. 12. *Who is able to kill and to destroy* for the transgression of it; It is his Law which is broken, and upon the Breach whereof, he cryes, *cursed be every one that hath not done*, *Deut* 29. 29. He is the Judge of all the *Earth*, *Gen* 18. 25, 26. Yea *The Lord is Judge himself*, *Psal:* 50 6 and we shall be judged *by his Law*, *James* 2. 10, 11, 12. and his judgement is, *that they that commit sinne are worthy of Death*, *Rom.* 1. 32 and he is the *King for ever and ever*, *Psal.* 10. 16. He *Raigneth and executeth Judgement*. Now who should commit the Rebell that offends, who should be the Author of the Captivity, and imprisonment of the *Delinquent*, but he who is the King, Judge, and Law-maker.

3. He doth actually *do it*, Rom: 11. 32. *συνέκλεισε ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν*, *God hath shut up all under disobedience*: he hath laid them up close Prisoners, for their disobedience: and they shall not go *out*, untill satisfaction be made. In the Parable *Matth:* 18. of the Lord, or Master, and his Servants, this is evident; and *Matth* 5. 25. It is the Judge, that delivers the Man to the Officer, to be cast into Prison. Look who it is that shall inflict the finall Punishment upon the Captives, if a Ransome be not paid for them, He it is, by whose Power and Authority they are committed, and to whom principally they are Prisoners, and Captives: Now this is God only, He can *cast both body and soule into Hell fire*, *Matth:* 10 28. and wicked men shall be destroyed from the *terrour* of his Presence, and the power of his Glory, 2 *Thes:* 1 9. In briefe, God is the Judge, the Law is the Law of God, the Sentence denounced is condemnation from God: the *Curse* inflicted, is the Curse of God; the Wrath wherewith men are punished, is the wrath of God, He that *finds a Ransome* is God, and therefore it is *properly* and strictly He, to whom sinners are Prisoners and Captives, 2 *Pet:* 2 4. §. 20.

And therefore when in the Scripture at any time, men are said to be in Bondage to Satnan: it is but as to the Officer of a Judge, or the Jaylor: to their Sinne, it is but as to their Fetters, as shall be afterwards more fully discovered.

And this removes the First Question and Answer of the *Racovians* to this purpose. *Socinus De Servatore*, expresses himselfe to the whole businesse of Redemption, in 3. Chapters: *Lib:* 1, §. 21.

Part. 2. Cap: 1,2,3. the summe of which, the *Catechists* have laboured to comprise in as many Questions and Answers. The first is.

Quid ad ea Testimonia, quæ nos a Christo testantur Redemptos, Respondes?

R. E *verbo redimendi non posse effici satisfactionem hanc, hinc est planum, quod de ipso Deo & in novo, & in priseo fœdere scribitur, eum redimisse populum suum ex Ægypto; eum fecisse redemptionem populo suo; deinde cum scriptum sit, quod Deus redemit Abrahamum & Davidem, & quod Moses fuerit Redemptor, & quod simus redempti e nostris iniquitatibus, aut e vana conversatione nostra, & e maledictione legis: Certum autem est Deum nemini satisfecisse; nec vero aut iniquitatibus, aut conversationi vanæ, aut legi satisfactum esse dici posse.*

"What doest thou Answer to those Testimonies, which witnesse that we are redeemed of "Christ?

"*Ans.* It is hence evident, that satisfaction "cannot be confirmed from the word Redeeming, because it is written of God himselfe, "both in the Old and New Testament, that he "redeemed his People out of Egypt, that he redeemed his people. 2. Because it is written "that God redeemed *Abraham*, and *David*, and "that *Moses* was a Redeemer, and that we are "redeemed from our iniquities, and our vain "conversation, and from the Curse of the Law; "for it is certain, that God made satisfaction to "none, nor can it be said, that satisfaction is "made either to our iniquites, or our vain conversation, or to the Law.

I say this whole Plea is utterly removed by what hath been spoken: For 1. In what sence *Redemption* is ascribed to God and *Moses*, without the least prejudice of that *proper* redemption that was made by the blood of Christ, hath been declared, and shall be farther manifested, when we come to Demonstrate the *Price* that was paid in this *Redemption*.

2. It is true, there is no Satisfaction made to our *sinne*, and *vaine conversation*, when we are redeemed: but Satisfaction being made to *him* to whom it is *due*, we are delivered from them. But of this afterwards.

3. Satisfaction is properly made to the *Law*, when the penalty which it threatens, and prescribes, is undergone, as in the case insisted on it was. In the mean time, our Catechists are sufficiently vaine, in supposing our Argument to lye in the word *redimere*; though something hath been spoken of the word in the Originall, yet our plea is from the thing it selfe.

§. 22. This *Socinus* thus expresses.

There

"There is also required he who held the Captive, otherwise he is not a Captive: To him in our deliverance, if we will consider the thing it selfe exactly, many things do Answer, for many things do detaine us Captives; Now they are sinne, the Divell, and the World, and that which followeth sinne, the guilt of eternall death, or the punishment of death appointed to us.

Requiritur & is, qui captivum detineat: alioqui captivus non esset: huic in liberatione nostra, si exactius rem ipsam consideare velimus, respondent multa. Multa quidem nos tanquam captivos detinebant: ea autem sunt peccatum, Diabolus, Mundus, & qui peccatum consequitur, mortis aeternæ reatus seu mortis aeternæ nobis decretum supplicium. De Servator. Lib. 1. Cap. 2.

Ans. A Lawfull Captive is detained two waies directly, and that two waies also. *Legally, Juridically*, and *Authoritatively*: so is sinfull Man detained Captive of God. The wrath of God abideth *on him*, *Joh.* 3. 36. as hath been declared.

2. *Instrumentally*, in subservience to the Authority of the other. So is Man in bondage to Sathan, and the Law, and feare of *death to come*, *Heb.* 2. 14, 15.

2. *Consequentially*, and by accident; so a man is detained by his *shackles*, as in the *filth* of the Prison: so is a man Captive to Sinne, and the World; nor are all these *properly* the detainers of us in Captivity, from which we are redeemed, any more then the Gallowes keeps a Malefactor in Prison, from which by a Pardon and Ransome he is delivered.

To proceed with the description of Redemption given; It is the delivery of him who was captive from prison, or captivity, and all the miseries attending that condition. §. 23.

1. What I meane by the Prison, is easily gathered from what hath been delivered concerning the Prisoner or Captive, and *him* that holds him captive. If the captive be a sinner as a sinner, and he who hold him captive be God, by his Justice making him lyable to Punishment, his captivity must needs be his *obnoxiousnesse* unto the wrath of God on the account of his Justice for sin. This are we delivered from by this *Redemption*, that is in the blood of Jesus, *Rom.* 3. 23, 24, 25. *For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God: Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood, to declare his righteousnesse for the remission of sinnes that are past, through the forbearance of God.* v. 23. is the description of the state of our Captivity,

vity, *having sinned we are come short of the Glory of God*; ὑστεροῦνται they fall *short* in their race, and are by no meates able to come up to a participation of God; our delivery and the meanes of it, is expressed *v.* 24. our delivery: we are *Justifyed freely by his Grace*; or delivered from that condition and state of sin, wherein it was impossible for us to reach and attaine the Glory of God. The procuring cause of which liberty is expressed in the next words, διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως. by the Redemption or Ransome paying that is in the blood of Jesus; that is the cause of our deliverance from that condition wherein we were: whence and how it is so, is expressed *v.* 25. God sent him forth, for that end, that we might have deliverance through *Faith in his blood*, or by Faith be made partakers of the Redemption that is in his blood, or purchased by it: and this to *declare his righteousnesse*; we have it this way, that the Righteousnesse of God may be declared, whereto Satisfaction is made by the death of Christ: for that also is included in the word, *propitiation*, as shall be afterward proved.

§. 24. Thus whilst men are in this *captivity*, the wrath of God abideth on them, *Joh.* 3. 36. and the full accomplishment of the execution of that wrath is called the *wrath to come*, 1 *Thes.* 1. 10. which we are delivered from.

In this sence are we said to *have Redemption Col.* 1. 14. in his *blood*, or to have deliverance from our *captivity* by the price he paid; and by his *death* to be delivered from the feare of death *Heb.* 2 15. or our obnoxiousnesse thereto; it being the *Justice* or *Judgement* of God, that they which commit sinne, are worthy of death, Rom. 1. 32. Christ by undergoing it delivered us from it.

Whence is that of the Apostle Rom. 8. 33, 34. *Who shall lay any thing to their charge, who shall condemne them*? Who should but God? It is God against whom they have sinned, whose the Law is, and who alone can pronounce *Sentence of Condemnation* on the offenders, & inflict *penalty* accordingly. Yea, but it is *God that Justifies*: that is, that frees men from their obnoxiousnesse to punishment for sin in the first sence of it, which is their *captivity*, as hath been declared; but how comes this about? Why *it is Christ that dyed*, it is by the *death* of Christ that we have this Redemption.

2 From all the *miseries* that attend that *state* and *condition*. These are usually referred to three heads. §. 25.

1. The *Power* of *Sathan*. 2. Of *Sinne*. 3. Of the *World*: from all which we are said to be Redeemed; and these are well compared to the *Iaylor*, *filth*, and *fetters* of the Prison, wherein the Captives are righteously detained.

For the first *Col* 1.13,14. *Who hath delivered us from the power of darkenesse, and hath translated us into the kingdome of his deare Sonne, in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgivenesse of sins.* the *power of darkenes*, is the *power of the prince of darkenes*, of *Sathan*: this God *delivers* us frō *v.*14. by the *Redemption that is in the blood of Christ*; & how? Even as he who delivers a *captive* frō the Judg by a price, delivers him also from the *Iaylor* who kept him in prison. By his *death*, which as hath been shewed, was a *price* & a *Ransom*, he deprived *Sathan* of al his power over us, which is called his destroying of him, *Heb.* 2.14. that is, not the Divell as to his Essence & Being, but as to his Power and Authority over those who are made partakers of his death.

The Words of *Socinus* to this purpose may be taken notice of. *Lib. De Servat.* 1. *Part.* 2. *Cap.* 2. §. 26.

"Nothing is wanting in this deliverance, that "it might wholly answer a true Redemtion, but "only that he who detained the captive should "receive the price: although it seemes to some that "it may be said, that the Divell received the price "which intervened in our Redemption, as the An-"tient Divines among whō was *Ambrose* & *Augustine* "made bold to speake, yet that ought to seeme "most absurd; & it is true that this price was re-"ceived by none. For on that account chiefely is "our deliverance not a true, but a metaphoricall "*redemption*, because in it there is none that should "receive the Price. For if that which is in the place "of a price, be received, (by him who delivers the "Captive) then not a metaphoricall but a true "Price had intervened, & thereupon our Redemp-"tion had been proper.

Nihil in hac liberatione desideratur, ut omnino veræ redemptioni respondeat, nisi ut is qui captivum detinebat, Pretium accipiat: quamvis autem quibusdam videatur, dici posse, *Diabolum, pretium quod in nostra liberatione intervenit*, accepisse, *quemadmodum antiquiores Theologi, inter quos* Ambrosius *&* Augustinus *ausi sunt dicere, tamen id perabsurdum videri debet, & recte est neminem id pretium accepisse affirmare. Ea siquidem ratione potissimum, non vera sed Metaphorica redemptio, liberatio nostra est; quocirca in ea nemo est* [illegible] *at*, [illegible] *scilicet qui captivum hominem detinebat) fuisset, jamnon meta* [illegible] *tervenisset, & propterea vera Redemptio esset.*

1. It is confessed, that nothing is wanting to constitute that we speak of to be a *true, proper,* & *reall Redemption,* but only that the *price paid,* be *received* of him, that delivered the *captives;* that this is God we *proved,* that the *price* is *paid* to him, we shal nextly prove.

2. The only reason given why the Price is no paid to any, is because it is not paid to the *Divell;* but was it the Law of Sathan we had transgressed? Was he the Judg that cast us into Prison? Was it to he whō we were indebted? Was it ever heard that the price of *Redemption* was payd to the Taylor? whether any of the *ancients* said so or no, I shal not now trouble my self to enquire, or in what sence they said it; the thing in it self is *ridiculous* & *blasphemous.* §. 27.

2. Sinne. *He Redeemed us from all iniquity,* Tit. 2. 14, and we were *Redeemed by the precious blood of Christ from our vaine conversation received by tradition from our Fathers,* 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. This redeeming us from our sinnes, respects two things. 1. The guilt of them that they should not condemn us: and 2. the power of them, that they should not rule in us: in the place mentioned, it is the latter that is principally intended, which is evident from what was opposed to the captivity under sinne that is spoken of; in the one place, it is *Purchasing to himselfe a peculiar people zealous of good workes,* Tit. 2. 14. in the other, *the purifying of our soules in obedience to the truth through the Spirit,* v. 22. Now we are redeemed from the power of our sin, by the blood of Christ; not immediatly, but consequentially; as a Captive is delivered frō his Fetters and Filth upon the payment of his Ransome: Christs satisfying the Justice of God, reconciling him to us by his death, hath also procured the *gift of his Spirit* for us, to deliver us from the *power* of our sinne. The foundation of this being laid in the *blood of Christ,* and the price which thereby he paid, our delivery from our sins belongs to his Redemption; and we are therefore said to be Redeemed by him from our *vaine Conversation.*

And the great plea of our Adversary, that this redemption is not proper, because we are *redeemed from our iniquities, and vain conversation,* to which no ransome can be payd, will then be freed from ridiculous folly, when they shall give an instance of a ransome being paid to the Prisoners fetters before his deliverance thereunto our sins do rather answer, then to the Judge.

[illegible] is a Redeeming of us from the Guilt of sinne, [illegible] wofold expression. 1. Of redeeming us from the

Curse

Curse of the Law, Gal:3.13. And 2. Of the *redemption of Transgression*, Heb:9.15.

For the First, the *Curse of the Law*, is the *Curse due to sinne*, Deut. 27.29 that is, to the transgression of the Law. This may be considered two wayes: 1. In respect of its *rise & fountaine*, or its *terminus a quo*. 2. In respect of its End, and Effect, or its *terminus ad quem*.

For the First; Or the *Rise* of it; it is the Justice of God, or the just and *Holy Will* of God, requiring punishment for sinne; as the *vengeance* that is inflicted actually for sinne, is called the *Wrath* of God, Rom.1.18. that is, his *Justice* and indignation against sinne. In this sence, to *redeeme us from the Curse of the Law*, is to make satisfaction to the Justice of God, from whence that Curse doth arise, that it should not be inflicted on us; and thus it falls in with what was delivered before, concerning our *Captivity* by the Justice of God. 2 As it is the *Penalty* it selfe: So we are delivered from it, by this *Ransome paying* of Christ, as the Punishment which we should have undergone, had not he *undertaken* for us, and redeemed us.

2. For the ἀπολύτωσις πεγκλάσεων, Heb:9.15. It can be nothing but making *reparation* for the injury done by transgression: It is a *singular* phraze, but may receive *some light* from that of *Heb.* 2.17. Where Christ is said to be an High Priest, εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ. to *reconcile the sinne of the People*: that is, to *make reconciliation* for them, of the sence whereof afterwards. 3. He *Redeemes* from the World, Gal 4.5. §. 29.

3. The Third thing is; That this *deliverance* from Captivity be by the *intervention of a price* properly so called; that Christ did pay such a *Price*: proved before, which is the foundation of this discourse. §. 30.

The word λύτρον, and those arising from thence, were specially insisted on; The known use of the word is, *redemptionis pretium*; so among the best Authors of the Greek tongue. ξωντα λαβόντες δεῖπναν ἀλλ' λύτραν. Zenoph Hellen. 7. *they took him away without paying his ransome*, or the price of his redemption and ἀπεμπε τὰ λύτρα τοῦ Ἀννίβα, καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἐπηγάγετο: saies *Plutarch* in *Fabius*: he sent their ransome to Annibal, and received the *Prisoners*. and from thence λύτρωσις of the same import and signification. So in the Argument of the first Book of the

Iliads, speaking of *Chrysis*, that he came to the Camp, βουλόμενος λυτρώσασθαι τὴν θυγάτερα, *to pay a price for the redemption of his Daughter.* And *Arist. Ethic. lib. 9. cap. 2.* Disputing whether a Benefit, or Good turne, be not to be repaid, rather then a favour done to any other, gives an instance of a Prisoner redeemed; τῷ λυτρωθέντι παρὰ λῃστῶν ποτερὸν τὸν λυσάμενον ἀντιλυτρωτέον, &c. whether he who is redeemed by the *payment of a ransome* from a *robber* be to redeeme him, who redeemed him, if *Captive*, &c. but this is so farre confessed, that if it may be evinced, that this price is paid to *any*, it will not be denied, but that it is a *proper price* of redemption, as before was discovered.

§. 31. That the death of Christ is such a Price, I proved abundantly, at the entrance of this discourse; it is so frequently and evidently expressed in the Scripture to be such, that it is not to be questioned, I shall not farther insist upon it.

All that our Adversaries have to object, is, (as was said) that seeing this *Price* is not paid to *any*, it cannot be a *price* properly so called, for as for the Nature of it, they confesse, it may be a *Price*, so *Socinus* acknowledgeth it. Saith he,

Propriam enim verbi redimendi significationem intelligo, cum verum pretium intervenit; verum autem pretium voco, non pecuniam tantum sed quicquid ut ei satisfiat qui captivum detinet datur, licet alioqui multa metaphorica in ejusmodi redemptione reperiantur Socin. de Serv. lib. 1. Part. 1. Cap. 1.

"I understand the proper use of the word to "*redeeme*, to be, when a true Price is given; true "Price I call not only mony, but whatever is given to him, that delivers the Captive, to satisfy "him, although many things in the Redemption "be Metaphoricall.

§. 32. That God detaines the *Captive*, hath been proved; that the *price* is paid to him, though it be not silver and gold, and that, that he might be satisfyed shall be farther evinced. So that we have Redemption properly so called; it remaines then that we farther manifest, that the price was paid to God.

§. 33. Although enough hath been said already to evince the truth of this, yet I shall farther put it out of question by the ensuing Observations and inferrences.

1. To the *payment of a price* or ransom *properly* so called which as is acknowledged is not necessary that it should be *mony or the like*, 1 *Pet.* 1. 18 but any thing that may satisfy him that detaines the captive, it is not required that it should be *payd into the hand* of him

him that is said to receive it; but only, that it be some such thing as he requires as the condition of *releasing* the Captive. It may consist in *personall service*, which is impossible to be *properly* paid into the hand of any. For instance; If a Father be held *captive*, and he that holds him so, requires that for the delivery of his Father, the Sone undertake a difficult and hazardous Warfare, wherein he is concerned; & he do it accordingly; this Sonne doth properly *ransome* his Father, though no *reall* price be paid into the hand of him that detained him. It is sufficient to prove that this ransome was paid by Christ unto God, if it be proved, that upon the Prescription of God, he did that, and *underwent* that which he esteemed, and was to him a valuable Compensation, for the delivery of sinners.

2. The *propriety* of paying a Ransome to any, where it lyes in undergoing the penalty that was due to the *Ransomed*, consists in the *voluntary* Consent of him to whom the Ransome is paid, and him that *pays* it, unto this *commutation*; which in this businesse we have firmely evinced. And the price paid by Christ could be no other. For God was not our detainer in Captivity as a *Soveraigne Conquerour*, that came upon us by force and kept us Prisoners, but as a *just Judge* and *Lawgiver*, who had seized on us for our Transgressions. So that not his *Power* and *Will* was to be treated withall, but his Law and Justice, and so the Ransome was properly paid to him, in the undergoing that *penalty* which his Justice required. §. 34.

3. There must some differences be allowed between *Spirituall, eternall*, and *Civill, Corporall, temporall* deliverances, which yet doth not make Spirituall Redemption to be *improper*: nay rather the other is said to be improper wherein it agrees not thereunto; The one is *Spirituall*, the other *Temporall*, so that in every circumstance it is not expected that they should agree. §. 35.

4. There are two things distinctly in God to be considered in this businesse. §. 36.

1. His Love, his will, or purpose. 2. His Justice, Law, and Truth. In respect of his Love, his will, his purpose, or good-pleasure, God himselfe found out, appointed, and provided this Ransome. The giving of Christ is ascribed to his Love, Will, and good pleasure, *Ioh.* 3. 16. *Rom.* 5. 8 & 8. 32. 1 *Ioh.* 4. 9, 10. as he had promised by his *Prophets* of old, *Luk.* 1. 67. But his Law

and Truth & Justice in their Severall considerations, required the *Ransome*, and in respect of them he accepted it, as hath been shewed at large: So that nothing in the world is more *vaine*, then that of our Adversaries; that God procured and appointed this price, therefore he did not accept it: That is, either Gods Love or his Justice must be denyed. Either he hath no *justice* against sinne, or *no Love* for sinners; in the Reconciliation of which two, the greatest and most intense *hatred* against sinne, & the most *unexpressible* Love to some sinners in the blood of his only Sonne, lyes the *great mistery* of the Gospell, which these men are unacquainted withall.

§. 37. 5. That God may be said to receive this *Price*, it was not necessary that any *Accession* should be made to his Riches by the *Ransome*, but that he underwent no losse *by our deliverance*. This is the difference between a *Conquerour* or a *Tyrant* and a just Ruler, in respect of their Captives, and Prisoners. Sayes the *Tyrant* or Conquerour, *pay me so much* whereby I may be *enriched* or I will not part with my Prisoner: Says the just Ruler and Judge, *take care that my justice be not injured*; that *my Law be satisfyed*, and I will deliver the prisoners. It is enough to make good Gods acceptance of the Price, that his Justice suffered not by the delivery of the Prisoner; as it did not *Rom.* 3. 25. yea it was exalted and made glorious above all that it could have been, in the *everlasting destruction* of the sinner.

§. 38. These things being thus premised, it will not be difficult to establish the Truth asserted; namely, that this *Price* or *Ransome* was paid to God. For

1. A *Price* of Redemption, a *Ransome* must be paid to some or other: The nature of the thing requires it. That the death of Christ was a *price* or Ransome properly so called, hath been shewed before; the ridiculous Objection, that then it must be payd to Sathan or our sinne, hath also been sufficiently removed, so that God alone remaines to whom it is to be paid. For unlesse to some it is paid, it is not a Price or Ransome.

§. 39. 2. The *Price* of Redemption is to be paid to him who detaines the Captive by way of Jurisdiction, Right, and Law Power. That God is he who thus detained the Captive, was also proved before. He is the *great householder* that calls all his Servants that doe, or should serve him, to an account, *Math.* 18.

18. 23. 24. σωτῆρος λόγον: and *wicked* men are κατάρας τέκνα. 2 *Pet.* 2 14. the *children* of his curse, obnoxious to it. It is his *Judgement that they which commit sin are worthy of death*, Rom. 1. 32. and Christ is a propitiation to *declare his Righteousnesse*, Ro. 3. 25. And it is his wrath from whence we are delivered by this Ransome, *Rom.* 2. 5. 1 *Thess* 1. last. the Law was his to which Christ was made obnoxious *Gal.* 4. 4. the *Curse* his which he was made, *Gal.* 3. 13. it was *his* will he came to do and suffer, *Heb.* 10 5. It was his will that he should drink off the *cup* of his passion, Mat. 26. It *pleased him to bruise him*. Is. 53. He *made all our iniquities to meet* upon him v. 5. so that doubtlesse this Ransome was paid to him; we intend no more by it then what in those places is expressed. §. 40.

3. This Ransome was also a Sacrifice, as hath been declared. Look then to whom the *Sacrifice* was offered, to him the Ransome was paid. These are but severall notions of the same thing. Now the Sacrifice he offered to God, *Eph.* 5. 2. to *him* then also, and *only* was this Ransome paid. §. 41.

4. Christ paid this Ransome as he was a *Mediatour* and *surety*: now he was the *Mediator between God and man*, and therefore he must pay this *Price* to one of them, either God, or man & it is not difficult to determine whether: 1 *Tim* 2. 5, 6. gives us this fully. He is the Mediatour, and as such he gave himselfe ἀντίλυτρον, a *Price of Redemption* to God.

From this description of *redemption* properly so called, and the Application of it to the *redemption* made by Jesus Christ we thus argue. §. 42.

He who by his own blood and death paid the price of our redemption to God, in that he underwent what was due to us, & procured our liberty & deliverance thereby, He made satisfaction properly for our sins; but when we were Captives for sin to the justice of God, & committed thereon to the power of Satan and Satan, Christ by his death and blood paid the price of our redemption to God, and procured our deliverance thereby: therefore he made Satisfaction to God for our sinnes.

For the farther confirmation of what hath been delivered, some few of the most eminent Testimonies given to this truth, are to be explained and vindicated, wherewith I shall close this Discourse of our Redemption by Christ. Out of the very §. 43.

many

many that may be insisted on, I shall chuse out only those that follow.

1. Rom. 3. 24, 25. *Being justifyed freely by his Grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood, to declare his righteousnesse for the remission of sinnes that are past, through the forbearance of God.* Redemption in its selfe, in its Effect, in respect of us, with all its causes is here expressed. Its effect in respect of us, is, that we are *justifyed freely*: δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν, not brought easily, and with *little labour* to be *righteous or honest*, as some *vainely* imagine (*Grot. in locum*) but *accepted freely* with God, without the performance of the workes of the Law, whereby the Jewes sought after Righteousnesse. 2. The *End* on the part of God, is, the declaration of his *Righteousnesse*. 3. The *meanes* procuring this *end* is, the *blood of Christ*: *redemption by Christ*, and *in his blood*.

4. The meanes of *communicating* this effect on the *part of God* is the setting forth Christ a *propitiation*: on our part as to application, it is *faith in his blood*.

§. 44. As to the *Effect* of our justification, it shall afterwards be considered. The manner, or rise of it rather, (for both may be denoted) on the *part* of God, is δωρεὰν, that is, freely: or as it is expounded in the next words, τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, *by his grace*. Our redemption and the effects of it are free 1. On the part of God, in respect of his purpose and decree, which is called ἐκλογὴ χάριτος, *Rom.* 11. 5. His great Designe, and contrivance of the worke of our Salvation, and deliverance. This he did *according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace*, *Ephes.* 1. 5, 6. according *to his good pleasure which he had purposed in himselfe*, v. 9. according *to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsell of his own will*, v. 11. And it is free in regard of the Love, from whence Christ was sent, *Joh.* 3. 16. which also is ascribed τῇ χάριτι θεοῦ, *Heb.* 2. 9. And it is free in respect of us: we do not obtaine it by the *workes of the Law*, *Rom.* 4. 6. neither can it be so attained, nor is that required of us; and free on our part, in that nothing of us is required in way of *satisfaction*, recompence, or ransome; *He spared not his Son*, but with him *freely gives us* all things, *Rom.* 8. δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν, we are *justified freely*, that is, we are delivered from our bondage without any Satisfaction made *by us*, or workes performed by us, to attaine

attaine it, God having *freely* designed this way of salvation, and sent Jesus Christ to do this work for us.

§. 45. *Ad justitiam vero perducuntur etiam sine labore qui ad minores virtutes, id est, philosophices requiri solet. fides enim ejus laboris compendium facit.* τὸν πόνον πολλοῖς ἡμῖν πάντα τ' ἀμαθ' ὁ Θεός. *Grot. in loc.* "They are brought to righteousnesse, without that labour "that is required for lesser, even Philosophicall virtues: Faith "makes an abridgement of the worke.

The πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the *great man*, in the whole interpretation of that Epistle, as of others of sundry sorts besides himselfe, is, that to be *justified*, is to be *brought to righteousnesse by the practice of vertue* and honesty (which answers to that the Scripture calls *sanctification*) with as grosse a *shutting* out of light, as can befall any man in the world. This with that notion which he hath of *Faith*, is the bottome of this Interpretation. But,

2. Let him tell us Freely, what instance he can give of this use of the word δωρεάν, which here he imposeth on us? that it should signify the *facility of doing a thing*: And withall, whether these words δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν, denote an *Act* of God, or of *them* that are justified? Whether being *justified freely by his grace*, be his *free justifying* of us, as to what is *actively* denoted, or our Easy performance of the workes of Righteousnesse? that δωρεάν, in this place, should relate to our *duties*, and signify *easily*; and not to the Act of God accepting us, and import freely, is such a violence offered to the Scripture, as nothing could have compelled the Learned man to venture on, but pure necessity of maintaining the *Socinian justification*.

3. For the *Philosophicall vertues*, which the Gods sold for labour, they were *splendida peccata*, and no more.

As to this part of the words, *Socinus* himselfe was not so far out of the way, as the *Annotator*; saith he, *Justificati gratis, sensus est, partam nobis esse peccatorum nostrorum absolutionem (id enim ut scis quod ad nos attinet reipsa justificari est) non quidem per legis opera, quibus illam commeriti sumus, sed gratis per gratiam Dei. De Servat. lib. 1. part. 2. cap 2.*

§. 46. 2. The *End* on the part of God, is ἔνδειξις δικαιοσύνης, the *declaration of his righteousnesse* δικαιοσύνη, is properly *Gods justice* as he is a Judge. It is true צדק is often rendered by the Seventy δικαιοσύνη, and by us from thence, *Righteousnesse*, which signifies

nifies indeed *benignity, kindnesse*, and *goodnesse*: and so צדקה which is *Righteousnesse*, is rendered by them sometimes ἔλεος *mercy*, and the circumstances of the place may sometime require that signification of the word; but *firstly* and *properly*, it is that *property* of God, whereby as a Judge, he renders to every one according to their ways before him, rewarding those that *obey* him, and punishing *transgressions*; This I have elsewhere declared at large: Hence he is, שפט צדק *Psal.* 9. 4. which as *Paul* speakes 2 *Tim.* 4. 8. is, ὁ δίκαιος κριτής, the *righteous Judge*, so *Rom.* 1. 32. 2 *Thess.* 1. 6. *Rev.* 15. 4. so *Isa.* 59. 16. *And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no Intercessor, therefore his arme brought Salvation unto him, & his* ¶ *Righteousnesse it sustained him.* His Righteousnesse *sustained* him in executing vengeance on the enemies of his Church. This is the *Righteousnesse* that God aimed to manifest, and to declare in our redemption by Christ: that he *might be just*, as the words follow; namely, that he might be *known to be just and righteous*, in taking such sore *vengeance* of sinne, in the *flesh* of Jesus Christ his Sonne, *Rom.* 8. 3. Hence did God appeare to be exceeding *righteous*, of *purer eyes*, then to *behold iniquity*. He declared to all the World, what was *due to sinne*, and what must be expected by men, if they are not partakers of the *Redemption* which is in the blood of Jesus Christ, *Rom.* 8. 3.

Diatrib. de Justit. Div.

§. 47.

Grotius would have δικαιοσυνη here to signify *goodnesse* and *bounty*; which as we deny not, but that in some places in the *Old* Testament where it is used by the LXX, it doth; or may doe, so we say here, that sence can have *no place*, which *no where* is direct and proper: for the thing intended by it in that sence, is expressed before in those words δορεὰν τῇ χάριτι αὐτοῦ, and is not consistent with that, that follows, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, which represents God, as he is, δίκαιος κριτής, as was spoken before.

§. 48.

Socinus goes another way, saies he. *In Christo, Deus ut ostenderet se veracem & fidelem esse, quod significant verba illa, justitiæ suæ, &c.* Referring it to Gods *Righteousnesse* of *verity* and *fidelity*, in fulfilling his promise of forgivenesse of sinnes. But, saies *Grotius*, Righteousnesse cannot be here interpreted, *de fide in promissis præstandis, quia hæc verba pertinent non ad Judæos tantum, sed ad Gentes etiam, quibus nulla promissio facta est.* "Because Gentiles are spo-"ken of, and not the Jews only, but to them there was no pro-"mise given. A reason worthy the Annotations; as though the

the *promise* was not made to *Abraham*, that he should be *heire of the world*, and to *all his seed*, not only according to the *first*; and as though the *Learned man* himselfe did not think the first *promise* to have been made, and alwaies to *have belonged* to *all* and every man in the World. But yet neither will the sence of *Socinus* stand, for the Reasons before given.

But how are these Ends brought about, that we should be δικαιόμενοι δωρεάν; and yet there should be, ἐνδείξις δικαιωσύνης? §. 49.

3. *Ans.* The Meanes procuring all this, is the blood of Christ; it is, διὰ τῆ ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: *by the redemption that is in Jesus Christ*: and how that Redemption is wrought, he expresseth, when he shews *how* we are made partakers of it, διὰ τῆ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, *through faith in his blood*. The redemption wrought and procured by the blood of Christ, is the *procuring* cause of all this. The *causa προηγουμένη*, is the *Grace of God*, of which before, the *causa προκαταρκτικὴ*, is this *blood* of Christ; This Redemption, as here, is called ἀπολύτρωσις, *Luk.* 21. 28. *Eph.* 1. 7. *Coll.* 1. 14. λύτρωσις, *Luke* 1. 68. *John* 2. 38. *Heb.* 9. 12. λύτρον, *Matth.* 20. 28. *Matth.* 10. 45. ἀντίλυτρον, 1 *Tim* 2. 6. and in respect of the effect. ῥύσις *Rom.* 4. 24. *Rom.* 11. 26. *Col.* 1. 13. 1 *Thess.* 1 10. This is the *procuring cause* as I said of the whole effect of Gods *free grace* here mentioned, *we are justified freely*, because we have Redemption by the blood of Christ, He *obtained* it for us by the price of his blood.

I rather abide on the former sence of λύτρον (from whence is ἀπολύτρωσις) to be a *price of redemption*, then to Interpret it by *lustrum*, and so to referre it to the *sacrifices of purification*, which belong to another consideration of the death of Christ; and yet the consideration of the blood of Christ, as a *Sacrifice*, hath place here also, as shall be discovered. This is that which is here asserted; we have forgivenesse of sinnes by the intervention of the *blood* of Christ, obtaining *Redemption* for us, which is that we ayme to prove from this place.

Grotius gives this Exposition of the words. *Christus per obedientiam suam (maxime in morte) & preces ei accedentes, hoc a patre obtinuit, ne is humanum genus gravibus peccatis immersum desereret, aut obduraret; sed viam illis daret ad justitiam perveniendi per Christum: & liberaret, nempe a necessitate moriendi in peccatis, viam patefaciendo per quam exire ista liceret.* "Christ by his obedience (especially in §. 50.

"his death) and the prayers accompanying it, obtained this of "his Father, that he should not forsake and harden mankind, "drenched in grievous sinnes, but should give them a way of "coming to righteousnesse by Jesus Christ, and should deliver "them from a necessity of dying in their sinne, by revealing a "way whereby they might escape it.

1. It is well it is granted, that the *death of Christ* respected *God* in the first place, and the obtaining somewhat of him, which the *Annotators friends* deny.

2. That the purchase of Christ was not for all Mankind; that they *might* be delivered, but for the *Elect*, that they *should be delivered*, ha's elsewhere been declared.

3. Christ *by his death*, did not obtain of his Father, that he should *reveale or appoint* that way of obtaining deliverance and Salvation, which by him we have. This, as the giving of Christ himselfe, was of the *free Grace* and love of God; nor is the appointment of the *way* of salvation, according to the Covenant of Grace, any where assigned to the *death of Christ*; but to the *Love* of God, sending his Sonne, and appointing him to be a Mediator; though the good things of the Covenant be purchased by him.

4. This is *all the effect* here assigned to the Bloodshedding of Jesus Christ; this is the Redemption we have thereby. *He obtained of his Father, that a better way of coming to Righteousnesse, then that of the Law, or that of Philosophy, might be declared to us.* The *mystery* of the whole is; Christ by his obedience to God, obtained this, that *Himselfe should be exalted to give a new Law, and teach a new Doctrine, in obedience whereunto we might come to be Righteous*: which must needs be an excellent explication of these words, *we have Redemption by his blood*: which plainly expresse the Price he paid for us, and the effect that ensued thereon.

§. 51. *Socinus* goes another way; says he.

"The intervention of the Blood of Christ, "though it moved not God to grant us delive- "rance from the punishment of sinne, yet it mo- "ved us to accept of it being offered, and to be- "lieve in Christ.

Interventus sanguinis Christi, licet Deum ad liberationem hanc a peccatorum nostrorum pœna nobis concedendum movere non potuerit, movit tamen nos ad eam nobis oblatam accipiendam, & Christo fidem habendam. Socin. ubi sup.

That

That is; the blood of Christ, being paid as a *Price of our Redemption*, hath no effect, in respect of him to whom it is paid, but only in respect of them, for whom it is paid; then which *imagination* nothing can be more ridiculous.

4. The meanes of *Application* of the Redemption mentioned, or *participation* in respect of us, is faith: It is διὰ πίστεως ἐν αἵματι αὐτοῦ, of this we have no occasion to speake. §. 52.

5. The *meanes of Communication* on the part of God, is in these words, ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation. God *set him forth* for this end and Purpose; the word προέθετο, may designe various Acts of God: As, §. 53.

1. His *purpose* and *determination*, or Decree of giving Christ; whence our Translators have in the *margent* rendred it *fore-ordained*, as the word is used, *Eph.* 1.9. ὃν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ, *which he fore-purposed in himselfe*. Or,

2. Gods *proposall* of him before hand, in *Types* and *Sacrifices* to the Jewes; the *preposition* πρὸ being often in composition used in that sence in this Epistle, Chap. 3.9. Chap. 11.35. Chap. 15.4. Or,

3. For the *Actuall Exhibition* of him in the *flesh*, when God sent him into the World. Or,

4. It may referre to the open *exposition* and *publication* of him in the World by the *Gospell*; for as we shall afterwards shew, the ensuing words hold out an *Allusion* to the *Arke*, which now in Christ the vaile being Rent, is *exposed* to the open view of Believers; Hence *John* tels us, *Rev.* 11.19. when the *Temple* was opened, *there was seen in it the Arke of the Testament*; which as it was not at all in the *Second* Temple, the true *Arke* being to be brought in, no more was it to be *seen* upon the opening of the Temple in the first where it was, being closed in the *Holyest of Holies*; but now in the Ordinances of the Gospell, the Arke is perspicuous; because θεὸς προέθετο, God hath set it forth to Believers.

Now he was *set forth* ἱλαστήριον, a propitiation. There *is none* but have observed, that *this* is the name of the *Covering* of the Arke, or the *Mercy seat*, that is applied to Christ, *Heb.* 9.5. but the true Reason and sence of it hath scarce been observed; *Ours* generally would prove from hence, that Christ did *propitiate* §. 54.

God by the *Sacrifice of himselfe*, that may have something from the generall notion of the word, referred to the *sacrificia ἱλαστικὰ* (whereof afterwards) but not from the *particular* intimated. The *Mercy seat* did not *attone* God for the sinnes that were committed against the Law, that was in the Arke, but *declared* him to be *attoned* and appeased. That this is the meaning of it, that, as the *Mercy seat* declared God to be Attoned, so also is Christ set forth to Declare, that God was *Attoned*, not to Attone him, *Socinus* contends at large, but to the utter confusion of his cause. For,

§. 55. 1. If this declares God to be *pacatus*, and *placatus*, then God was *provoked*, and some *way* was used for his Attonement. And

2. This is indeed the *true import* of that *Type*, and the Application of it here by our Apostle. The *Mercy seat* declared God to be appeased; but how? by *the blood of the Sacrifice that was offered* without, and brought into the *holy place*; The High Priest never went into that place, *about the worship of God*, but it was with the *blood of that Sacrifice*, which was expresly appointed to *make Attonement*, *Levit.* 16. God would not have the *Mercy seate* once seen, nor any *pledge* of his being Attoned, but by the *blood* of the Propitiatory Sacrifice. So it is here, God sets out Jesus Christ as a *propitiation*; *declares* himselfe to be *appeased* and *reconciled*; but how? by the *blood of Christ*; by the *sacrifice of himselfe*, by the *Price of* Redemption which he paid. This is the intendment of the Apostle; Christ by his *Blood*, and the *Price he paid* thereby, with the *Sacrifice* he made, having *Attoned* God, or made *Attonement* with him for us, God now sets him forth, the Vaile of the Temple being Rent, to the *eye* of all *Believers*, as the *Mercy seat* wherein we may see God fully reconciled to us. And this may serve for the vindication of the Testimony to the Truth insisted on; and this is the same with 2 *Cor.* 3. 17.

§. 56. It would be too long for me to insist in particular, on the full vindication of the other Testimonies, that are used for the confirmation of this Truth. I shall give them therefore *together* in such a way, as that their Efficacy to the purpose in hand, may be easily discerned.

1. We are *bought by Christ* saith the Apostle; ἠγοράσθητε, *ye are bought*, 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. but this buying may be taken *Metaphorically* for a meer Deliverance, as certainly it is, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. denying *the Lord*

that

that bought them: i.e. delivered them, for it is spoken of God the Father? It may be so, the word may be so used, & therefore to shew the *propriety* of it here, the Apostle addes ἐ τιμῆς, *with a price: ye are bought with a price*: To be *bought with a price*, doth no where signify to be *barely* delivered, but to be delivered with a *valuable compensation* for our deliverance; but what is this price wherewith we are *bought*? 1 *Pet* 1.18. *not with silver or gold*, but πολυ ἀιμαπχειτῳ, with the *pretious honourable blood of Christ*: why τίμιον ἅιμα, the pretious blood? That we may know, that in this *businesse* it was valued at a sufficient rate for our Redemption; and it did that, which *in temporall civill Redemption* is done by *silver and Gold*, which are given, as a Valuable Consideration for the Captive. But what kind of Price is this Blood of Christ? It is λύτρον, *Matth.*20 28. That is, a *Price of redemption*; whence it is said, that he gave himselfe for us; ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς, *Titus* 2. 14. that he might *fetch us off with a ransome*: but it may be that it is called λύτρον, not that *he put himselfe* in our stead, and underwent what was due to us; but that his death was *as it were* a Price, because thereon we were delivered. Nay, but his life was λύτρον properly, and therefore he calls it also ἀντίλυτρον, 1 *Tim.* 2.6. ἀντὶ, in composition signifies either *opposition*, as 1 *Pet.* 2.25. or *substitution* and *commutation*, *Matth.* 2 22. in the first sence, here it cannot be taken, therefore it must be in the latter; He was ἀντίλυτρον: that is, did so pay a *ransome*, that *he himselfe became that*, which we should have been, as it is expressed, *Gal.* 3.13. *He redeemed us from the Curse, being made a curse for us*: to whom he paid this Price was before declared, and the Apostle expresseth it, *Eph.*5.2. what now is the issue of all this; We have *Redemption thereby*, *Eph.*1.7. in whom we have ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ ἅιματος αὐτοῦ, *redemption by his blood*; as it is againe asserted in the same words, *Col.*1 14. But how came we by this Redemption? He obtained it of God for us, he entred into Heaven, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος, having *found, or obtained everlasting redemption for us*; by the Price of his blood he procured this deliverance at the *hand* of God. And that we may know that this Effect of the death of Christ is *Properly* towards God, what the immediate *issue* of this Redemption is, is expressed. It is *forgivenesse of sinnes*, *Eph.*1.7. *Col.*1.13. *Rom.* 3.24,25.

And

And this is as much as is needfull to the first Notion of the Death of Christ, as a *Price*, and *Ransome*, with the issues of it, and the confirmation of our first Argument from thence for the *Satisfaction* of Christ.

CHAP. XXIX.

Of Reconciliation by the Death of Christ as it is a Sacrifice.

THE next consideration of the Death of Christ, is of it as a *Sacrifice*; and the proper Effect thereof is *Reconciliation* by his Death as a Sacrifice. §. 1.

1. Reconciliation in generall, is the *renewall of lost friendship and peace between persons at variance*. To apply this to the matter treated of, the ensuing positions are to be premised.

1. There was at first in the state of *innocency*, *friendship* and peace between God and man. God had no enmity against his Creature: He approved him to be good: and appointed him to *walke in peace, communion, confidence, and boldnesse* with him. *Gen.* 3. Nor had man, on whose heart the Law and Love of his Maker was *written*, any enmity against his *Creator*, *God*, and *Rewarder*.

2. That by sinne there is *division*, separation and breach of *peace* and friendship introduced between God and the Creature; §. 2. Isa. 59. 2. *Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sinnes have hid his face from you*, Isa. 63. 10. *They rebelled against him, therefore he was turned to be their enemy and fought against them. There is no peace to the wicked saith my God.* Is. 48. 22. and therefore it is that upon a delivery from this condition we are said (and not before) to *have peace with God*, Rom 5. 1.

3. That by this *breach of peace and friendship* with God, God §. 3. was *alienated* from the sinner, so as to be angry with him, & to renounce all peace and friendship with him, considered as such, and in that condition. He that *believeth not, the wrath of God abides on him*. *Joh.* 3. 36. And therefore by nature, and in our naturall condition, we are *children of wrath* Ep. 2. 3. that is, obnoxious to the wrath of God, that abides upon unbelievers; that is, unreconciled Persons.

4.

4. This enmity on the part of God, consists

§. 4.

1. In the purity and holiness of his nature, whence he cannot admit a *guilty defiled Creature* to have any communion with him; He is a God of purer eyes then to behold iniquity. *Heb.* 1.13. And *sinners* cannot serve him because he is an *Holy God, a jealous God, that will not forgive their Transgressions nor their sinnes. Josh.* 24.19.

2. In his *will* of punishing for sinne, Rom. 1.32. *It is the Judgement of God that they which commit sinne are worthy of death*; and this from the Righteousnesse of the thing it selfe 2 Thess. 1.6. *It is a righteous thing with God to recompence tribulations* to sinners: He is not a God that hath *pleasure in iniquity*, Psal. 5.4,5,6.

3. In the sentence of his Law, in the establishing and execution whereof his truth and honour were engaged, *In the day thou eatest thou shalt dye*, Gen. 2.17. *And cursed is every one that continueth not &c.* Deut. 27.29. And of this enmity of God against sinne and sinners, as I have elsewhere at large declared, there is an *indelible* perswasion abiding on the hearts of all the Sons of men, however by the *stirrings* of Lust and craft of Sathan, it may be more or lesse *blotted* in them. hence

4. As a *fruit* and evidence of this enmity, God abominates their persons, *Psal.* 1.4,5,6. *rejects* and *hates* their *dutyes* and *ways*, Prov. 15.8,9. And prepares *Wrath* and Vengeance for them to be inflicted in his appointed time, Ro. 2.5. All which make up *perfect enmity* on the part of God.

§. 5.

2. That man was at enmity with God as on his part, I shall not need to prove; because I am not treating of our *Reconciliation* to God, but of his Reconciliation to us.

§. 6.

5. Where there is such an *enmity* as this, begun by *offence* on the one part, and continued by anger and purpose to punish on the other, to make *Reconciliation* is properly to *propitiate*, and *turne* away the Anger of the person offended, and thereby to *bring* the *Offendor* into favour with him againe, and to an enjoyment of the *same*, or a friendship built on better conditions then the former. This description of *Reconciliation* doth God himselfe give us, *Job.* 42.7,8,9. *And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite, my wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my Servant Job*

hath. Therefore take unto you now seven bullocks and seven Rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for your selves a burnt offering, and my Servant Job shall pray for you, for him will I accept, least I deale with you after your folly, in that you have not spoken of me the thing that is right, like my servant Job, &c. The *offenders* are *Eliphaz* and his two *Friends*: The *offence* is their *folly in not speaking aright of God*: The issue of the breach is, that the *wrath or anger of God was towards them*; Reconciliation is the turning away of that wrath; the *meanes* whereby this was to be done, appointed of God, is the *Sacrifice of Job*, for Attonement.

§. 7. This then is that which we ascribe to the Death of Christ, when we say that as a *Sacrifice* we were *reconciled* to God by it; or that he made *reconciliation* for us. Having made God our *enemy* by sinne (as before) Christ by his death turned away his *Anger*, appeased his *wrath*, and brought us into favour againe with God: Before the proof of this, I must needs give one caution, as to some *termes* of this Discourse, as also remove an *objection* that lyes at the very entrance against the whole nature of that which is treated of.

§. 8. For the first, when we speake of the Anger of God, his wrath and his being appeased toward us, we speake after the *manner of men*, but yet by the allowance of God himself; not that God is properly *angry*, and *properly* altered from that state and appeased, whereby he should properly be *mutable* and be *actually* changed; but by the *Anger* of God, which sometime in Scripture signifyeth his *Justice* from whence punishment proceeds, sometimes the effects of anger or punishment, it self, the obstacles before mentioned on the part of God, from his *nature*, *Justice*, *Law*, and *Truth* are intended; and his being appeased toward us, his being satisfyed as to all the *barrs* so laid in the way from *receiving* us to *favour*, without the *least* alteration in *him*, his *nature*, *will*, or *Justice*: & according to the *analogie* hereof, I desire that whatever is spoken of the *Anger* of God, & his being *appeased* or altered which is the language wherein he converseth with us, and instructs us to wisdome, may be *measured* and interpreted.

2. The objection I shall propose in the wordes of *Crellius*.

§. 9. *Si in eo sita est dilectio, quod Deus nos dilexerit & filium suum miserit ἱλασμὸν pro peccatis nostris, quomodo Christus morte sua demum iram*

Dei

Dei adversus nos incensum placarit; nam cum dilectio illa Dei qua plane fuit summa, causa fuit cur Deus filium suum charissimum misserit, necesse est ut iram jam suam adversus nos deposuerit: nonne alter eodem tempore & impense amabit, & non amabit? si Deus etiam tum potuit nobis irasci, cum filium suum charissimum suprema nostræ felicitatis causa meritissima objiceret, quod satis magnum argumentum erit, ex effectu ejus petitum, unde cognoscamus Deum nobis non iratum esse? Crell: Defen. Socin. con. Grot. part. 6.

To the same purpose *Socinus* himself. *Demonstravi non modo Christum Deo nos, non autem Deum nobis reconciliasse, verum etiam Deum ipsum fuisse qui hanc reconciliationem fecerit. Socin. de Servator. lib. 1. pa. 1. cap. 1.*

"If this be the chiefest and highest love of God, that he sent "Christ his only Sonne to be a propitiation for our sinnes, "how then could Christ by his death appease the wrath of "God, that was incensed against us? For seeing that Gods love "was the cause of sending Christ, he must needs before that "have laid aside his anger: for otherwise should he not in- "tensely love us, and not love us at the same time? And if God "could then be angry with us, when he gave up his Sonne to "bitter death for our everlasting happinesse, what Argument "or evidence at any time can we have from the effect of it, "whence we may know, that God is not farther angry with "us?

To the same purpose is the Plea of the *Catechist: Cap.* 8. *De Morte Christi. Quest* 31, 32.

Ans. The *Love* wherewith God loved us, when he *sent his Son* §. 10.
to dye for us, was the most *intense*, and supreame in its own kind: nor would admit of any *hatred* or *enmity* in God toward us, that stood in opposition thereunto. It is every where set forth as the *most intense Love*, *Joh.* 3.16. *Rom.* 5.7,8. 1 *Joh.* 4. 10. Now this Love of God, is an eternall free act of his *Will*: his *Purpose*, *Rom.* 9.11. *His good Pleasure*, his Purpose that he purposed in himself, as it is called; It is his θέλημα, βούλησις, 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. εὐδοκία, as I have elsewhere distinctly declared; a Love that was to have an *efficacy* by means appointed: but for a *Love of Friendship*, *Approbation*, *Acceptation*, as to our *Persons* and *wayes*, God *bears none* unto us, but as considered in Christ, and for his sake. It is contrary to the whole Designe of the Scripture, and innu-

merable particular Testimonies, once to *fancy* a love of friendship, and acceptation toward any in God; and not consequent to the Death of Christ.

§. 11. 2. This Love of Gods *purpose* and *good Pleasure*, this *charitas ordinativa*, hath not the least inconsistency with those hinderances of Peace and Friendship, on the *part* of God, before mentioned; for though the Holinesse of Gods Nature, the justice of his Government, the *veracity* of his word, will not allow that he take a *Sinner* into Friendship and communion with himselfe, without *satisfaction* made to him, yet this hinders not, but that in his Soveraigne good will and pleasure, he might *purpose* to *recover* us from that condition, by the holy meanes which he appointed: God did not *love us*, and not love us, or was angry with us, at the same time, and in the same *respect*. He *loved* us, in respect of the Free purpose of his Will, to send Christ to redeeme us, and to satisfy for our sinne; he was *angry* with us, in respect of his *violated Law*, and *provoked justice*, by sinne.

3. God loves our Persons, as we are his Creatures, is *angry* with us, as we are his *sinners*.

4. It is true, that we can have no greater *Evidence* and Argument of the Love of Gods *good will and pleasure* in generall, then in sending his Sonne to dye for sinners; and that he is not angry with them, with an anger of *hatred*, opposite to that Love; that is, with an *eternall purpose* to destroy them; but for a *Love* of Friendship and Acceptation, we have *innumerable* other pledges, and evidences, as is known, and might be easily declared.

§. 12. These things being premised, the confirmation of what was proposed ensues.

1. The *use* and *sence* of the words, whereby this Doctrine of our *reconciliation* is expressed; evinces the Truth contended for. ἱλάσκεσθαι, καταλάσσειν and ἀποκαταλάσσειν, which are the words used in this businesse, are as much as *iram avertere*, to turne away anger; so is *reconciliare*, *propitiare*, and *placare*, in Latine: *Impius, ne audeto placare iram Deorum*, Was a Law of the twelve Tables. ἱλάσκομαι, *propitior*, *placor*, ἱλασμὸς, *placio*, *exoratio*: *Gloss. vetus*; and in this sence is the word used; ὅσα μέντοι πρὸς ἱλασμοὺς Θεῶν ἢ ὁράτων ἀποτροπὰς συνηγόρευον οἱ μαντεῖς. *Plut. in Fabio*. to *appease their Gods*, and turne away the things they feared. And the same Author tells us of a way taken, ἐξίλασθαι τὸ μηνίμα θεοῦ,

to

to *appease the anger of God.* And *Xenophon* useth the word to the same purpose; πολλὰ μὲν πέμπων ἀναθήματα χρυσᾶ πολλὰ, ἢ ἀργυρᾶ, πάμπολλα ἢ θύων, ἐξιλασάμην ποτὲ αὐτον. And so also doth *Livy* use the word *reconcilio: non movit modo talis oratio regem, sed etiam reconciliavit Annibali. Bell. Macedon.* and many more instances might be given. God then being angry and averse from Love of Friendship with us, as hath been declared, and Christ being said thus to make Reconciliation for us with God, he did fully turne away the *wrath of God* from us, as by the *Testimonies* of it will appeare.

Before I produce our witnesses in this cause, I must give this one caution: It is not said any where *expresly*, that *God is reconciled to us*, but that we are *reconciled* to God. And the *sole reason* thereof is, because he is the *party offended*, and we are the *parties offending*; now the partie offending, is alwaies said to be *reconciled to the party offended*, and not on the contrary; so *Math.* 5. 23, 24. *If thy Brother have ought against thee, go and be reconciled to him*; The Brother *being the party offended*, he that *had offended*, was to be *reconciled* to him by turning away his anger: and in *common speech*, when one hath *justly provoked* another, we bid him, *goe*, and *reconcile himselfe* to him, that is, *do that* which may *appease* him, and give an entrance into his favour again; so is it in the *Case* under consideration; being the parties *offending*, we are said to be *reconciled* to God, when his anger is *turned away*, and we are *admitted* into his favour. Let now the Testimonies speak for themselves. §. 13.

Rom. 5. 10. *When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Sonne*; κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ: we were reconciled to God, or *brought againe into his favour.* Amongst the many reasons that might be *given* to prove the *intention* of this Expression to be, *that we were reconciled to God*, by the *averting of his Anger* from us, and our *accepting* into favour; I shall insist on *some few* from the Context. §. 14.

1. It appears from the Relation that this *expression* bears to that of v. 8. *whilest we were yet sinners Christ died for us*; with which this upon the matter is the same, we *are reconciled to God by the death of his Sonne*: Now the intent of this expression, *Christ died for us sinners*, is, He dyed to bring *us sinners* into the favour of God; nor will it admit of any other sence; so is *our being re-*

conciled to God by the Death of his Sonne: And that this is the meaning of the Expression, *Christ died for us*, is evident from the illustration given to it by the Apostle, v. 6,7. *Christ died for the ungodly*, How? as *one man* dyeth for another; that is, to deliver him from death.

§. 15. 2. From the description of the same thing in other words v. 9. *being justifyed by his blood*: that it is the same thing upon the matter that is here intended, appeares from the *contexture* of the Apostles speech, *Whilest we were yet enemyes Christ dyed for us; much more being Justifyed by his blood.* And *if when when we were enemies we were reconciled to God*; the Apostle repeats what he had said before; *if when we were enemies Christ dyed for us*, and *we were justifyed by the blood of Christ*, that is, *if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God?* Now to be *justifyed, is Gods Reconciliation to us*, his Acceptation of us into favour, not our *Conversion* to him, as is known and confessed.

§. 16. 3. The Reconciliation we *have with God*, is a thing *tendred* to us, and we do receive it: *v.* 11. καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν, *we have received the reconciliation or Attonement*: Now this cannot be spoken in reference to our Reconciliation to God, as on our side, but of his to us, and our acceptation with him: Our Reconciliation to God is our Conversion: but we are not said to *receive our Conversion*, or to have our *Conversion* tendred to us; but to Convert our selves, or to be Converted.

§. 17. 4. The state and condition from whence we are delivered by this Reconciliation, is described in this, that we are called Enemies, *being enemies we were reconciled.* Now Enemyes in this place are the same with Sinners. And the Reconciliation of Sinners, that is, of those who had rebelled against God, provoked him, were obnoxious to wrath, is certainely the procuring of the *favour* of God for them. When you say, such a poore *conquered Rebell*, that expected to be tortured and slaine, is by meanes of such an one reconciled to his prince; what is it that [illegible] intend? Is it that he begins to *like* and *love* his *Prince* only, [illegible] his *Prince* lays down his wrath and pardons him?

[illegible] the considerations before insisted on, declaring in [illegible] are saved by the death of Christ, prove our Re- [illegible] God, to be our Acceptation with him, not [illegible]

2 Cor.

2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19, 20, 21. Is a place of the same importance with that above mentioned, wherein the *Reconciliation* pleaded for, is asserted, and the nature of it explained. *And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himselfe by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ Reconciling the world to himselfe, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of Reconciliation. Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christs stead be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sinne for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the Righteousnesse of God in him.* §. 18.

There is in the words a twofold *Reconciliation.*

1. Of God to man *v.* 18. *God hath Reconciled us to himselfe by Iesus Christ.*

2. Our *Reconciliation* to God, in the *Acceptance* of that *reconciliation*, which we are exhorted to.

The first is that enquired after; the Reconciliation whereby the anger of God by Christ is turned away, and those for whom he dyed are brought into his favour; which comprizes the *Satisfaction* proposed to confirmation. For

1. Unlesse it be that God is so Reconciled and Attoned, whence is it that he is thus proclaimed to be a *Father* towards sinners as he is here expressed? Out of Christ he is a *consuming* fire to sinners, and *everlasting burnings*, Is. 33. 14. *Being of purer eyes then to behold iniquity*, Hab 1. 13 *Before whom no sinner shall appeare or stand*, Ps. 5. 4. 5. So that where there is no Sacrifice for sinne, there *remaines nothing to Sinners, but a certaine fearefull looking for of judgement, and fiery indignation that shall consume the Adversaries*, Heb. 10, 26, 27. How comes then this *jealous* God, this *Holy* God, and *just Iudge*, to command *some* to Beseech *Sinners* to be reconciled to him? the reason is given before. It is because he *reconciles* us to himselfe by Christ, or in Christ: That is, by Christ His *Anger* is *Pacified*, His *Iustice Satisfyed*, and himselfe appeased, or Reconciled to us. §. 19.

2. The Reconciliation mentioned, is so expounded in the Cause and Effect of it, as not to admit of any other interpretation. §. 20.

1. The *Effect* of Gods being *reconciled*, or his reconciling the world to himself, is in those words, *Not imputing to them their trespasses.*

passes. God doth so Reconcile us to himself by Christ, as not to impute our trespasses to us. That is, not dealing with us according as Justice required for our sinnes upon the account of Christs Remitting the penalty due to them; laying away his *Anger*, and receiving us to favour. This is the immediate fruit of the Reconciliation spoken of: if not the Reconciliation its selfe, *non-imputation of sinne*, is not our Coversion to God.

§. 21. 2. The cause of it is expressed *v.* 21. *He made him to be sinne for us, who knew no sinne.* How comes it to passe that God the *righteous Judge* doth thus reconcile us to him selfe, and not impute to us our sinnes? It is because he hath made Christ so be sinne for us; That is, either a *Sacrifice* for sinne, or as sinne, by the *imputation* of our sinne to him. He was *made sinne* for us, as we are made the *Righteousnesse of God in him.* Now we are made the Righteousnesse of God by the imputation of his Righteousnesse to us. So was he made sinne for us by the imputation of our sinne to him. Now for God to *Reconcile us to himselfe* by *imputing* our sinne to Christ, and thereon *not imputing* them to us, can be nothing but his being *appeased* and *attoned* towards us, with his receiving us to his favour, by and upon the account of the death of Christ.

§. 22. 3. This *Reconciling* of us to himself, is the Matter committed to the Preachers of the Gospell, whereby, or by the declaration whereof, they should perswade us to be reconciled to God. He hath commited to us, τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς; this Doctrine concerning Reconciliation mentioned; *We therefore beseech you to be reconciled to God.* That which is the matter whereby we are perswaded to be reconciled to God, cannot be our Conversion it selfe, as is pretended. The Preachers of the Gospell are to declare this word of God, *viz. that he hath reconciled us to himselfe*, by the blood of Christ, the blood of the new Testament that was shed for us, and thereon perswade us to accept of the tidings, or the subject of them, and to be at Peace with God. Can the sence be, we are *converted* to God, therefore be ye *converted.* This Testimony then speakes clearely to the matter under debate.

§. 22. 3. The next place of the same import is, Eph. 2.12,13.14, 15,16. *That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the common-*

commonwealth of Israel, & strangers from the Covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were farre off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us. Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the Law of commandements contained in Ordinances, for to make in himselfe of twaine one new man, so making peace. And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the Crosse having slaine the enmity thereby.

Here is mention of a twofold Enmity.

1. Of the *Gentiles* unto God. §. 23.

2. Of the *Iewes*, and *Gentiles*, among themselves.

Of the *Gentiles* unto God, *v.* 12. Consider them as they are there described, and their Enmity to God is sufficiently evident. And what in that estate was the respect of God unto them? What is it towards such persons as there described? The wrath of God *abideth on them*, Joh. 3. 36. they are *children of wrath*, Eph. 2. 3. So are they there expresly called: He hateth all the *workers of iniquity*, Psal. 5. 5. And will by no meanes *acquit the guilty*, Exod. 34. 7. Yea he *curseth those families that call not on his name.*

2. Of the *Iewes* and *Gentiles* among themselves: which is expressed, both in the thing it selfe, and in the cause of it; It is called Enmity, and said to arise from, or be occasioned, and improved by the Law of Commandements contained in Ordinances; The occasion, improvement, and management of this Enmity between them, see elsewhere.

2. Here is mention of a twofold Reconciliation. §. 24.

1. Of the *Iewes* and *Gentiles* among themselves, *v.* 14, 15. *He is our peace, and hath made both one, slaying the enmity, so making peace.*

2. Of *both unto God*, v. 16. *that he might reconcile both unto God.*

3. The manner whereby this Reconciliation was wrought; in his *body by the Crosse.*

The Reconciliation unto God is that aymed at: This Reconciliation is the reconciling of God unto us, on the account of the blood of Christ, as hath been declared. The bringing of us into his favour, by the laying away of his wrath and enmity against us: Which appeares

§. 25. 1. From the cause of it expressed: that is, the *Body* of Christ, by the *Crosse*, or the death of Christ. Now the Death of Christ was immediately for the Forgivenesse of sins. *This is the blood of the new Testament that was shed for many for the forgivenes of sins.* It is *by shedding* of his *blood*, that we have *remission* or *forgivenes*. That this is by an Attoning of God, or our acceptance into favour, is confessed.

§. 26. 2 From the expression it selfe: ἀποκαταλλάξη ἐν-ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ Τῷ θεῷ denotes one party in the businesse of Reconciliation He made peace between them both; between the *Gentiles* on the one hand, and the *Iewes* on the other; and he made peace between them both, and God; *Iewes* and *Gentiles*, on the one hand, and *God* on the other: So that God is a party in the businesse of Reconciliation, and is therein reconciled to us: for our reconciliation to him, is mentioned in our Reconciliation *together*, which cannot be done without our *Conversion*.

§. 27. 3. From the description of the enmity given *v.* 12. which plainely shews, (as was manifested) that it was on both sides. Now this Reconciliation unto God is by the removall of that Enmity. And if so, God was thereby reconciled, and *attoned*, if he hath any Anger or Indignation against sinne, or sinners.

§. 28. 4. Because this Reconciliation of both to God, is the great cause and meanes of their Reconciliation among themselves. God through the blood of Christ, or on the account of his death, receiving *both* into favour, their mutuall enmity *ceased*, and without it never did, nor ever will. And this is the Reconciliation accomplished by Christ.

§. 29. The same might be said of the other places, *Col.* 1. 20, 21. But I shall not need to multiply Testimonyes to the same purpose. Thus we have Reconciliation by Christ, in that he hath made Attonement or Satisfaction for our sinnes. The observations given on these Texts, being suited to *obviate* the Exceptions of *Socinus* treating of this *subject*, in his book *de Servatore*, without troubling the Reader with the Repetition of his words.

§. 30. That which in the next place I thought to do, is to prove that we have this *Reconciliation* by the death of Christ as a *Sacrifice*. But because I cannot do this to my own Satisfaction, without insisting first, on the whole Doctrine of *Sacrifices* in generall.

Secondly

Secondly, on the *institution*, Nature, End, and Efficacy of the *Sacrifices* of the *Aaronicall* Priesthod. Thirdly, the respect and Relation that was between them, and the *Sacrifice* of Christ, both in generall and in particular: And from all these considerations at large deducing the Conclusion proposed: And finding that this procedure would draw out this Treatise to a length, utterly beyond my expectation, I shall not proceed in it; but referre it to a peculiar discourse on that subject.

§. 31. That which I proposed to confirmation at the entrance of this *Discourse*, was the *Satisfaction* made by the blood of Christ. This being proposed under severall considerations hath thus farre been severally handled: That his death was a *Price*, that we have *Redemption* thereby properly so called, was first evinced. That truth standing, the Satisfaction of Christ is sufficiently established, our Adversarys themselves being Judges. The *Sacrifice* that he offered in his death hath also been manifested. Hereof is the Reconciliation now delivered, the Fruit, and Effect. This also is no lesse destructive of the designe of these men: what they have to *object* against that which hath been spoken, shall have the next place in our Discourse.

§. 32. Thus then our *Catechists* to this businesse, in the 31, and 32, Questions of the 8 Chap. which is about the Death of Christ.

What say you then to those places, that affirme that he reconciled us to God?

1. "That the Scripture no where saies, that God "was reconciled to us by Christ But this only, "that by Christ, or the Death of Christ we are "reconciled, or reconciled to God, as may appeare "from all those places, where reconciliation is "treated of. Wherefore from those places, the "satisfaction cannot be proved. 2. Because it is "evident in the Scripture, that God reconciled us "to himselfe, which evinceth the opinion of the "Adversaries, to be altogether false, 2 *Cor.* 5 18. *Col.* 1. 20, 22.

Ad hæc vero, quod nos Deo Reconciliârit quid affers?

Primum, nusquam scripturam asserere, Deum nobis a Christo reconciliatum; verum id tantum, quod nos per Christum aut mortem ejus, simus reconciliati, vel Deo reconciliati, ut ex omnibus locis, quæ de hac reconciliatione agunt, videre est. Quare nullo modo ex iis omnibus locis ea satisfactio eatur potest. deinde vero id aperte in Scripturis extat, Deum nos sibi reconciliasse, id opinionem Adversariorum prorsus falsam ostendit. 2 Cor. 5. 18. Col. 1. 20, 23.

Anſ. 1. Whether there be any mention of such a Reconciliation, as whereby the Anger of God is turned away, and we

Received into Favour, in the *Scripture*, the Reader will judge from what hath been already proposed, and thither we appeale. It is not about *words and syllables* that we contend, but *things* themselves. The *Reconciliation* of God to us by Christ, is so expressed, as the Reconciliation of a Judge to an Offender, of a King to a Rebell, may be expressed.

2. If Christ made Reconciliation for us, and for our sins an Attonement, he made the *Satisfaction* for us which we plead for.

3. It is true; God is said *to reconcile us* to himselfe, but alwaies by *Christ*, by the *blood of Christ*: proposing himselfe as reconciled thereby, and declaring to us the Attonement; that we may turne unto him.

§. 34. They adde.

But what thinkest thou of this Reconciliation?

Quid vero de hac reconciliatione sentis?

Christum Jesum nobis, qui propter peccata nostra Dei inimici eramus, & ab eo abalienati, viam ostendisse, quemadmodum nos ad Deum converti, atq; ad eum modum ei reconciliari oporteat.

Ans. 1. "That Jesus Christ shewed a way to "us, who by Reason of our sinnes, were enemies "to God, and Alienated from him, how we ought "to turne unto God, and by that meanes be re-"conciled to him.

§. 35. *Ans.* I suppose there was never a more *perverse* description of any *thing*, Part, or Parcell of the *Gospell*, by any *Men* fixed on. Some of the *Excellencies* of it may be pointed out.

1. Here is a *Reconciliation* between *two* parties, and yet a Reconciliation but of *one*; the other excluded.

2. An Enmity on *one* side only, between God and Sinners, is supposed, and that on the part of the Sinners; when the Scriptures do much more abound in setting out the *Enmity* of God against them as such; his *wrath abiding on them*, as some will find one day to their eternall sorrow.

3. Reconciliation is made nothing but Conversion, or Conversion to God; which yet are *termes* and *things*, in the Scriptures every where distinguished.

4. We are said to be *Enemies* to God, *propter peccata nostra*, when the Scripture saies every where, that *God is an Enemy to us*, *propter peccata nostra*. He hateth and is Angry with sinners, *his judgement is that they which commit sinne, are worthy of Death.* Rom. 1. 32.

5. Here is no mention of the *Death* and *Blood* of Christ, which in

in every place in the whole Scripture where this Reconciliation is spoken of, is expressly laid downe as the *Cause* of it: and necessarily denotes the Reconciliation of God to us by the averting of his Anger, as the Effect of it.

6. Did Christ by his Death *shew us a way*, whereby we might come to be reconciled to God or convert our selves? What was that way? Is it, that God lays *punishment*, and Affliction, and Death on them who are no way *liable* thereunto? What else can we learne from the Death of Christ, according to these men? The truth is, they mention not his Death, because they know not how to make their ends hang together. §. 36.

This is the summe of what they say; We are *Reconciled to God*, that is, we *Convert* our selves; by the *Death of Christ*, that is, not *by his death*, but according to the *Doctrine* he Teacheth: and this is the summe of the Doctrine of Reconciliation, Christ *teacheth us a way how we should convert our selves to God*. And so much for Reconciliation.

CHAP. XXX.

The Satisfaction of Christ, on the Consideration of His Death, being a Punishment, further evinced, and vindicated from the Exceptions of Smalcius.

THE Third consideration of the Death of Christ, was of it, as it was *Penal*, as therein he underwent *Punishment* for us, or that punishment which *for sin was due* to us. Thence directly is it said to be *satisfactory*. About the *word* its selfe, we do not contend; nor do our Adversaries except against it, if the thing it selfe be proved that is intended by that Expression this Controversy is at an end. Farther to open the nature of *Satisfaction*, then by what is said before about *bearing* our I see no reason; our ayme in that *word* is known to all sence of it obvious. This is made by some the *general* the whole businesse. I have placed it on the peculiar ration of Christs *bearing our sinnes*, and undergoing 6. 1.

for us. What our *Catechists* say to the whole, I shall briefly consider.

§. 2. Having assigned some *Causes*, and Effects of the Death of Christ, partly true in their own place, partly false. They aske Q. 12.

Nonne est etiam aliqua alia mortis Christi causa?

Is there no other cause of the Death of Christ?

Nulla prorsus; etsi nunc vulgo Christiani sentiunt, Christum morte sua nobis salutem meruisse, & pro peccatis nostris planarie satisfeciisse, quæ sententia fallax est & erronea, & admodum perniciosa. Cat. Racov. de Mor. Christi cap. 8. q. 12.

Ans. "None at all. As for that which Chri-
"stians commonly think, that Christ by his
"Death, merited salvation for us, and satisfied
"fully for our sinnes, that opinion is false (or
"deceitfull) erroneous, and very pernitious.

That the *men* of this perswasion are *bold* men, we are not now to learne; Only this Assertion, that there is *no other cause* of the Death of Christ, but what they have mentioned, is a new *experiment* thereof.

If we must believe, that these men know *all things*, and the *whole mind* of God, so that all is *false and pernitious*, that lies beyond their *roade* and *understanding*, there may be some colour for this *Confidence*. But the Account we have already taken of them, will not allow us to grant them this plea.

§. 3. 2. Of the *Merit* of Christ, I have spoken briefly before. His *Satisfaction* is the thing opposed chiefely; What they have to say against it, shall now be considered. As also how this *imputation*, or Charge, on the common faith of Christians, about the *Satisfaction of Christ*, to be *false*, *erroneous*, and *pernitious*, will

§. 4. be mannaged.

Qua ratione?

Quod ad id quod fallax sit & erronea, attinet, id hinc perspicuum est, quod non solum de ea nihil extet in scripturis, verum etiam Scripturis & sanæ rationi repugnat?

Q. 13. *How is it false, or deceitfull?*

"That it is false (or deceitfull) and eroneous
"is hence evident; that not only there is nothing
"of it extant in the Scripture, but also that it is
"repugnant to the Scriptures, and sound rea-
son.

For the truth of this suggestion, that it is not extant in Scripture, I referre the Reader to what hath been discoursed from the Scripture about it already; When they, or any for them, shall answer, or evade the Testimonies that have been produced, or may yet be so, (for I have yet mentioned none

of

of those which *immediately* expresse the *dying* of Christ for us, nor his being our Mediator and Surety in his death) they shall have liberty (for me) to boast in this manner. In the meane time we are not concerned in their wretched confidence. But let us see how they make good their Assertion by instances.

§. 5.

Q. 14. *Shew that in order?*

"That it is not in the Scripture, this is an Argument, that the Assertors of that opinion doe "never bring evident Scriptures for the proofe of "it; But knit certaine consequences by which "they endeavour to make good what they assert: "which as it is meet to admit, when they are necessarily deduced from Scripture, so it is certaine they have no force, when they are repugnant to the Scripture.

Demonstrandi ordine?

Id non haberi in Scripturis argumento est, quod istius opinionis assertores nunquam perspicuas Scripturas afferunt, ad probandam istam opinionem: verum quasdam consecutiones nectunt, quibus quod asserunt efficere conantur; quas ut admittere aequum est, cum ex Scripturis necessario adstruuntur, ita ubi Scripturis repugnantur, eas nullum vim habere certum est: Quest. 15.

But what is it that we do not prove by expresse Scripture, and that in abundance? That our *iniquity was layd upon Christ*; that he *was bruised, grieved, wounded, killed for us*, that he *bare our iniquitys*, & that in his *owne body on the tree*, that he was *made sin for us*, and a *Curse*, that we *deserved death*, and he *dyed for us*, that he *made his soule an offering for sinne, layd down his life a price and ransome for us*, or in our *stead*, that we are thereby *redeemed and reconciled* to God, that our *iniquitys being layd on him*, and he *bearing* them, (that is the punishment due to them) *we have deliverance*, God being *attoned*, and his wrath removed, we prove not by consequence, but by *multitudes* of *expresse Testimonyes*. If they meane that the word *Satisfaction* is not found in Scripture in the businesse treated of, we tell them that כפר is, and λύτρον, ἀντίλυτρον, and λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, καταλλαγή, (all words of a *cognate significancy* thereto, and of the same importance as to the Doctrine under consideration) are frequently used: It is indeed an hard taske to find, *Satisfaction*, the word, in the *Hebrew* of the *Old* Testament, or the *Greeke* of the *New*; But the thing it selfe is found expressly *an hundred times over*; and their *great Master* doth confesse, that it is not the *Word*, but the thing it selfe, that he oppoſeth. So that without any thanks to them at all, for granting, that *Consequences* from Scripture may be allowed

allowed to prove matters of Faith, we assure them our Doctrine is made good by innumerable *expresse Testimonies* of the word of God, some whereof have been by us now insisted on; and moreover, that if they and their Companions did not wrest the Scriptures to *strange* and *uncouth sences*, never heard of before amongst men professing the name of Christ, we could willingly *abstaine* wholly from any expression, that is not ῥητῶς found in the word it selfe. But if by their Rebellion against the Truth, and attempts to pervert all the expressions of the word, the most cleare and evident, to *perverse* and horrid *abominations*, we are necessitated to them, they must *beare* them unlesse they can prove them not to be true.

Let the Reader observe, that they grant, that the consequences we gather from Scripture would *evince* that which we plead and contend for, were it not but that they are *repugnant* to other Scriptures. Let them then manifest the Truth of their pretension by producing those other Scriptures, or confesse that they are *selfecondemned*.

§. 6. Wherefore they aske.

Q. *How is it repugnant to the Scripture?*

A. "In this sort, that the Scriptures do every "where testify, that God forgives sinne freely, 2 "*Cor.* 5 19. *Rom.* 3. 24, 25. But Principally under "the New Covenant, *Ephes.* 2. 8. *Math.* 18. 23. "Now nothing is more opposite to free remission, "then satisfaction; so that if a Creditor be satis-"fied, either by the Debtor himselfe, or by any "other in the name of the Debtor, he cannot be "said to forgive freely.

Qui vero Scripturæ repugnat? Ad eum modum, quod Scripturæ passim, Deum peccata hominibus gratuito remittere, testentur, 2 Cor. 5. 19. Rom. 3. 24, 25. potissimum vero sub N. Fœdere, Ephes. 2. 8. Math 18 23. &c. At remissioni gratuitæ nihil adversatur magis, quam satisfactio. Cui enim creditori satisfit, vel ab ipso debitore, vel ab alio debitoris nomine, de eo dici non potest vere, eum debitum gratuito ex ipsa gratia remisisse.

If this be all that our *Consequences* are repugnant unto in the Scripture, we doubt not to make a speedy Reconciliation. Indeed there was never the least difference between them. Not to dwell long upon that which is of an easy dispatch.

§. 7. 1. This Objection is stated solely to the consideration of *Sinne* as a *Debt*, which is *Metaphoricall*. *Sinne* properly is an Offence, a Rebellion, a Transgression of the Law, an Injury done, not to a *private* Person, but a Governor in his Government.

2.

2, The two first places mentioned, 2 *Cor.* 5. 18,19.20. *Rom.* 3. 24,25. do expresly mention the *payment* of this Debt by Christ, as the Ground of Gods Forgivenesse, Remission, and Pardon; The payment of it, I say, not as considered *Metaphorically*, as a *Debt*, but the making an Attonement and Reconciliation for us, who had *committed* it, considered as a *Crime*, and Rebellion, or Transgression. §. 8.

3. We say, that God doth most *freely* forgive us, as *Ephes.* 2. 8. *Math*: 18.23. without requiring any of the *debt* at our hands, without requiring any Price or Ransome from us, or any satisfaction at our hands; but yet he forgives us for *Christs sake*, seting forth him to be a *propitiation through faith in his blood*, he laying downe his *Life* a *Ransome* for us, God not *sparing him*, but giving him up to Death for us all. §. 9.

4. The Expression of another satisfying in the name of the *Debtor*, intends either one *procured* by the *debtor*, and at his entreaty undertaking the work, or one *gratiously* given, and assigned to be in his stead, by the *Creditor*. In the *first* sence it hath an inconsistency with *free remission*, in the Latter, not at all. §. 10.

The Truth is, men that dreame of an opposition between the *satisfaction* made by Christ, the *surety*, and *Mediator* of the new Covenant, and *free Remission* made to us, are utterly ignorant of the whole *mystery* of the Gospell, nature of the Covenant, and whole Mediation of Christ; advancing *carnall imaginations* against innumerable Testimonies of the Scripture, witnessing the blessed *Conspiration* between them, to the praise of the *glorious grace of God*. But they say,

That it is contrary to *Reason* also, Because it would hence follow, "That Christ underwent eternall "Death, if he satisfied God for our sinnes: seeing "it is manifest, that the punishment we deserved "by our sinnes, was eternall Death. Also it "would follow, that we should be more bound "to Christ, then to God himselfe, as to him who "had shewn us greater favour in satisfaction, but "God receiving satisfaction afforded us no fa- "vour. §. 11.

Cedo qui justud rationi repugnet?

Id quidem hinc perspicuum est, quod sequeretur Christum æternam mortem sustinuisse, si Deo pro peccatis nostris satisfecisset: cum constet pœnam quã homines peccatis meruerant æternam mortem esse: deinde consequeretur, nos Christo, quam Deo ipsi devinctiores esse, quippe qui satisfactione multum gratiæ nobis ostendisset; Deus vero exacta satisfactione, nulla prorsus Gratia nos prosecutus fuisset.

What little reliefe this plea will afford our Adversaries, will quickly appeare. For

1. I have proved that Christ underwent that *death* that was *due* unto sinners, which was all, that *Justice*, Law, or Reason required. He underwent it, though it was impossible for him to be detained by it.

2. If the *Racovians* doe not think us obliged to God, for *sending his Son* out of his infinite & eternall *love* to *die* for us, causing al our *iniquities to meet on him*, *justifying* us freely, (who could do nothing for our own *delivery*) through the Redemption that is in the blood of Christ, we must tell them, that (we *blesse his holy name*) we are not of that mind; but finding a dayly fruit of his love and kindnesse, upon our soules, doe know that we are bound unto him *eternally*, to *Love*, *Praise*, *Serve*, *honour*, and glorify him, beyond what we shall ever be able to expresse.

§. 12. 2. For the enquiry made, and comparison instituted, between our obligation to the Father and the Sonne, or which of them we are most beholding to, we professe we cannot speake unto it. Our obligation to both, and either respectively, is such, that if our *Affections* were extended immeasurably to what they are, yet the utmost and exactest *heigth* of them, would be due to both, and each of them respectively. We are so bound to one, as we cannot be more to the other; because to both in the absolutely highest degree. This we observe in the *Scriptures*, that in mentioning the worke of *Redemption*, the *rise*, *fountaine*, and spring of it is still assigned to be in the Love of the Father: The carrying of it on in the *love*, and *Obedience* of the Sonne, and so we order our thoughts of Faith towards them. The Father being not one whit the lesse free and gracious to us, by *loving us* upon the *Satisfaction* of his Sonne, then if he had forgiven us (had it been possible) without any Satisfaction at all.

§. 13. And thus is this Article of the Christian Faith, contrary to Scripture, thus to Reason. They adde.

Cedo etiam, quî hæc opinio est perniciosa?

How also is it pernitious?

Ad eum modum, quod hominibus fenestram ad peccandi licentiam aperiat, aut certe ad socordiam in pietate

A. "In that it openeth a doore unto men to "sin, or at least incites them to sloath in follow-"ing after holinesse. But the Scripture witnesseth "that this amongst others is an end of the death

of

" of Christ, that he might redeeme us from our " iniquity and deliver us from this evill world. "that we might be redeemed from our vain con- " versation, and have our consciences purged " from dead workes, that we might serve the " living God, *Tit* .2.14. *Gal.*1. 4. 1 *Pet.*1 .18. " *Heb.*9.14.

colenda eos invitet. Scriptura vero testatur, cum inter alios Christi mortis finem esse, ut redimeremur ab omni iniquitate, ex hoc seculo nequam eriperemur, & redimeremur ex vana conversatione a patribus tradita, & mundaremur conscientia a mortuis operibus ad serviendum Deo viventi. Tit.2. 14. Gal. 1. 4. 1 Pet. 1. 18. Heb. 9. 14.

That the deliverance of us from the Power and Pollution of our sinne, the *purifying* of our soules and Consciences, the making of us a *peculiar* people of God, zealous of good workes that we might be *holy* and *blameleſſe before him in love*, is one *eminent end* of the death of Christ, we grant. For this end by his death, did he procure the *spirit* to *quicken* us, *who were dead in trespasses and sinnes, sprinkling us with the pure water thereof*, and giving us dayly suplyes of Grace from him, that we might grow up in holinesse before him, untill we come to the measure in this life assigned to us in him.

But that the consideration of the Crosse of Christ, and the *Satisfaction* made thereby, should open a doore of licentiousnesse to sinne, or encourage men to sloath in the wayes of Godlinesse, is fit only for them to assert, to whom the Gospell is *folly*.

What is it I pray in the Doctrine of the *Crosse*, that should thus dispose men to *licentiousnesse* and *sloath*? Is it that God is so provoked with every sinne, that it is impossible, and against his nature to forgive it, without inflicting the punishment due thereto? Or is it that God so loved us, that he gave his only *Sonne* to dye for us, or that Christ loved us, and washed us in his own blood? Or is it that God for Christs sake doth *freely* forgive us? Yea but our Adversaries say, that God freely forgives us; yea but they say it is *without* Satisfaction. Is it then an *encouragement* to sinne, to affirme that God *forgives us freely* for the Satisfaction of his Sonne? and not to say, that he forgives us freely without Satisfaction? doth the adding of *Satisfaction* whereby God to the *highest* manifested his indignation and wrath against sinne; doth that I say make the difference, & give the Encouragement? Who could have discovered

§. 14.

this but our *Catechists* and their Companions? Were this a season for that *Purpose*, I could *easily* demonstrate that there is no *Powerfull* or effectuall *motive* to abstaine from sinne, no encouragement or incitation unto holinesse, but what riseth from or cleaveth unto the *Satisfaction* of Christ.

§. 15. And this is that which they have to make good their *charge* against the *common Faith*, that it is *false*, *erroneous*, and *pernitious*. Such worthy *foundations* have they of their great *superstruction*, or rather so *great* is their *Confidence*, and so *little* is their *strength* for the pulling down of the *Church built* upon the Rock.

§. 16. They proceed to consider what Testimonies and proofes (they say) we *produce* for the confirmation of the truth contended for. What (they say) we pretend from Reason (though indeed it be from innumerable places of Scripture) I have vindicated not long since to the full in my book of the *vindictive justice of God*, and answered all the Exceptions given thereunto; so that I shall not translate from thence what I have delivered to this purpose, but passe to what followes.

De Justit. divin. Diatrib

§. 17 Question 12 they make this enquiry.

Quæ vero sunt Scripturæ e quibus illi opinionem suam adstruere conantur? Ea, quæ testantur Christum vel pro peccatis nostris mortuum. deinde, quod nos redemit, aut dedit semetipsum & animam suam Redemptionem pro multis: Tum quod noster Mediator est. Porro quod nos reconciliarit Deo, & sit propitiatio pro peccatis nostris; Deniq; ex illis Sacrificiis, quæ mortem Christi, seu figuræ adumbraverunt.

Which are the Scriptures out of which they endeavour to confirme their opinion?

A "Those which testify that Christ dyed for "us, or for our sinnes, also that he redeemed us, "or that he gave himselfe or his life a Redemp"tion for many; Then, that he is our Mediatour: "moreover, that he reconciled us to God, and is "a propitiation for our sinne. Lastly, from those "Sacrifices which as figures shadowed forth the "death of Christ.

So do they *huddle* up together those *very many* expresse Testimonies of the Truth we plead for, which are recorded in the Scripture. Of which I may clearely say, that I know no one truth in the whole Scripture, that is so freely and fully delivered; as being indeed of the greatest importance to our soules. What they except in particular against any of the *Testimonies* that may be referred to the *heads* before recounted, (except those which have been already spoken to) shall be considered in the order wherein they proceed.

They

They say then

"For what belongeth unto those Testimonies "wherein it is contended that Christ dyed for us, "it is manifest that Satisfaction cannot necessa- "rily be therein asserted, because the Scripture "witnesseth that we ought even to lay down our "lives for the brethren, 1 *Joh.* 3 16. And *Paul* "writes of himselfe, *Col.* 1 14. Now I rejoyce in "my affliction for you, and fill up the remainder "of the affliction of Christ for his body which is "the Church. But it is certaine, that neither do "Believers satisfy for any of the bretheren; "nor did *Paul* make satisfaction to any for the "Church.

§. 18.

Quod attinet ad illa Testimonia in quibus habetur Christum pro nobis mortuum, ex iis satisfactionem adstrui necessario non posse hinc manifestum est, quod Scriptura testetur, etiam nos pro fratribus animas ponere debere 1 Joh. 3. 16. *& Paulus de se scribat* Col. 1. 24. *nunc gaudeo &c. Certum autem est, nec fideles pro fratribus cuiquam satisfacere, neque* Paulum *cuiquam pro Ecclesia satisfecisse.*

Qest. 23. *What then is the sence of these words* [Christ dyed for us.]

"That these words [*for us*] do not signify in "our place or stead, but for us, as the Apostle ex- "pressly speakes 1 *Cor.* 8. 11. which also alike "places do shew; where the Scripture saith, that "Christ dyed for our sinnes, which word can- "not have this sence, that Christ dyed instead of "our sinnes, but that he dyed for our sinnes, as "it is expressly written *Rom.* 4. 25. Moreover "these words [*Christ dyed for us*] have this sence, "that he therefore dyed, that we might imbrace "and obtaine that eternall Salvation which he "brought to us from Heaven, which how it is "done you heard before.

At horum verborum, Christum pro nobis esse mortuum, qui sensus est?

Is, quod hæc verba [pro nobis] *non significent loco vel vice nostri, verum propter nos, uti etiam Apostolus expresse loquitur,* 1 Cor. 8. 11. *Quod etiam similia verba indicant, cum Scriptura loquitur, pro peccatis nostris mortuum esse Christum; quæ verba eum sensum habere nequeunt, loco seu vice nostrorum peccatorum mortuum esse; verum propter peccata nostra esse mortuum; uti* Rom. 4. 25. *manifeste Scriptum legimus. Ea porro verba (Christum pro nobis mortuum esse) hanc habent vim, eum idcirco mortuum, ut nos salutem æternam, quam is nobis cælitus attulit amplecteremur, & consequemur, quod qua ratione fiat, paulo superius accepisti.*

Resp. Briefely to state the difference between us about the meaning of this expression [*Christ dyed for us*] I shall give one or two observations upon what they deliver, then confirme the *common Faith*, and remove their exceptions thereto. §. 19.

1. Without any attempt of proofe they oppose *vice nostri*, and *propter nos*, as contrary & inconsistent; & make this their Argument, that Christ did not dy *vice nostri*, because he dyed *propter*

nos. When it is one Argument whereby we prove that Christ dyed in our stead, because he dyed *for us*, in the sence mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 8. 11. where it is expressed by ὑπὲρ, because we could no *otherwise* be brought to the end aymed at.

2. Our sence of the expression is evident from what we insist upon, in the Doctrine in hand. Christ *dyed for us*, that is, he underwent the *death and Curse that was due to us*, that we might be delivered therefrom.

§. 20. 3. The last words of the *Catechists* are those wherein they strive to hide the abomination of their *hearts* in reference to this business. I shall a little lay it open.

1. Christ say they, *brought us eternall Salvation from Heaven*; that is, *he preached a Doctrine in obedience whereunto, we may obtaine Salvation.* So did *Paul.*

2. *He dyed that we might receive it*; that is, rather then he would *deny the truth* which he *preached*, he suffered himselfe to be put to death. So did *Paul*; and yet he was not *Crucifyed for the Church.*

3. It is not indeed the *death* of Christ, but his *Resurrection* that hath an influence into our receiving of his Doctrine, & so our obtaining Salvation. And this is the sence of these words, (*Christ dyed for us.*)

§. 21. For the confirmation of our Faith from this expression, (*Christ dyed for us.*) we have

1. The *common sence*, and customary usage of *humane* kind as to this expression. When ever one is in danger, and *another* is said to come and *dye for him* that he may be delivered, a *substitution* is still understood. The ἀντίψυχοι of old, as *Damon* and *Pythias &c.* make this manifest.

§. 22. 2. The *Common usage* of this expression in Scripture confirmes the sence insisted on. So *David wished* that he had *dyed* for his Sonne *Absolon*, that is, *dyed in his stead*, that he might have lived 2 *Sam.* 18. 33. And that supposall of *Paul Rom.* 1. 11. of one daring to dye for a *good man*, relating (as by all Expositours on the place is evinced) to the practice of some in *former dayes*, who to deliver others from *death*, had given themselves up to *that* whereunto *they* were *obnoxious*, confirmes the same.

§. 23. 3. The Phrase it selfe, of ἀποθανεῖν, or ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, which

which is used *Heb.* 2. 9. 1 *Pet.* 1. 21. *Rom.* 5. 6, 7, 8. 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. sufficiently proves our intention, compared with the use of the *preposition* in other places; especially being farther explained by the use of the preposition ἀντὶ, which ever denotes a substitution, in the same sence and businesse, *Matth.* 20. 28. *Matth.* 10. 45. 1 *Tim.* 2. That a *Substitution* and *Commutation* is alwayes denoted by this preposition (if not an opposition which here can have no place) 1 *Pet.* 3. 9. *Rom.* 12. 14. *Matth.* 5. 38. *Luk.* 11. 13. *Heb.* 12. 16. 1 *Cor.* 11. 15. amongst other places are sufficient evidences.

4. Christ is so said to dye ἀντὶ ἡμῶν, so as that he is said in his *death* to have *our iniquityes layd upon him*, to *beare our sinne* in his own body on the tree, to be made sinne and a curse for us, to offer himselfe a *Sacrifice for us*, by his death, his blood, to pay a *price* or *ransome* for us, to *redeem*, to *reconcile us to God*, to do away our sinnes in his blood, to free us from wrath, and condemnation, and sinne. Now whether thus to *die for us*, be not to *dye* in our place and stead, let *Angels* and *men* judge. §. 24.

5. But, say they, this is all that we have to say in this businesse; *Yet we ought to lay downe our lives for the Brethren*; and *Paul* saith, *that he filled up the measure of the afflictions of Christ, for his bodies sake the Church*, but neither the *one*, nor the *other* did make satisfaction to God by their death, or affliction. But,

1. If all we had to Plead for the sence of this Expression, *Christ died for us*, depended solely on the *sence* and *use* of that word ὑπὲρ, then the Exception would have this *force* in it. The word is once or twice used in another sence, in another businesse; therefore the sence of it contended for in this businesse, cannot be such as you seek to maintaine. But, §. 25.

1. This Exception at best, in a cause of this *importance*, is most frivolous, and tends to the *disturbance* of all sober Interpretation of Scripture.

2. We are very farre from making the single sence of the *Preposition*, to be the *medium*, which in the *Argument* from the whole expression we insist on.

2. The passage in 1 *Jo.* 3. 16. being a part of the Apostles *perswasive* to *Love*, Charity, and the fruits of them, tending to the relieve of the Brethren, in Poverty, and distresse, disclaimes all intendment, and possibility of a *substitution* or *Commutation*, nor

nor hath any intimation of undergoing that which was due to another, but only of being ready to the utmost to *assist* and relieve them. The same is the condition of what is affirmed of *Paul*; Of the *measure of affliction*, which in the *infinite wise Providence*, and Fatherly care of God, is proportioned to the *mysticall* body of Christ his Church, *Paul* underwent his share for the good of the whole. But that *Paul*, that any Believers were *Crucified for the Church*, or dyed for it, in the sence that *Christ died for it*, that they *Redeemed* it to God by their own blood, it is notorious blasphemy once to imagine. The meaning of the phrase (*He died for our sinnes*) was before explained. Christ then *dying* for us, being made *sinne* for us, *bearing our iniquity*, and redeeming us by his blood, *died in our place and stead*, and by his Death made satisfaction to God for our sinne.

§. 26. Also that Christ made satisfaction for our sinne, appears from hence, that he was our *Mediator*. Concerning this, after their Attempt against *proper Redemption* by his blood, which we have already considered, Q. 28. They enquire.

Quid ad hæc dicis, quod Christus sit Mediator inter Deum & homines, aut N. fœderis?

What say you to this, that Christ is the Mediator of the New Covenant between God and Man? and Answer

Cum legatur Moses fuisse Mediator Gal. 3. 19. *(puta inter Deum & populum Izrael aut prisci fœderis) neque eum satisfeciisse deo ullo modo constet, ne hinc quidem quod mediator dei & hominum Christus sit, colligi certo poterit, eum satisfactionem aliquam, qua deo pro peccatis nostris satisfieret peregisse.*

Ans. "Seeing it is read, that *Moses* was a Mediator, *Gal.* 3. 19. (namely of the Old Covenant between God and the people of Israel) "and it is evident, that he no way made satisfaction to God; neither from hence, that Christ "is the Mediator of God and man, can it be certainly gathered, that he made any satisfaction "to God for our sinne.

I shall take leave before I proceed, to make a returne of this Argument to *them* from whom it comes, by a meer change of the instance given. Christ they say, our High Priest, offered *himselfe to God* in heaven: Now *Aaron* is expressly said to be an *High Priest*, and yet he did not *offer himselfe* in *Heaven*, and therefore it cannot be certainly proved, that *Christ* offered himselfe in Heaven, because he was an *High Priest*. Or thus: *David was a King, and a type of Christ*; but *David* raigned at *Jerusalem*, and was a temporall King: It cannot therefore be proved, that Christ

Christ is a *spiritual King* from hence, that he is *said to be a King*. This Argument I confesse *Faustus Socinus* could not Answer when it was urged against him by *Sidelius*: But for the former, I doubt not but *Smalcius* would quickly have Answered, that it is true; it cannot be necessarily proved, that Christ Offereth himselfe in Heaven, because he was an *High Priest*, which *Aaron* was also, but because he was *such an High Priest*, as entred into the *Heavens* to appeare personally in the presence of God for us, as he is described to be. Untill he can give us a better Answer to our Argument, I hope he will be content with this of *ours* to his. It is true, it doth not appeare, nor can be evinced necessarily, that Christ made *satisfaction* for us to God, because he was a *Mediator* in generall, for so *Moses* was who made no satisfaction; but because it is said, that he was *such a Mediator* between *God* and *Men*, as gave his Life a *Price of Redemption* for them for whom with God he mediated, 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. it is most evident and undeniable; and hereunto *Smalcius* is silent.

What remaines of this Chapter in the *Catechists*, hath been already fully considered; so to *them* and Mr B. as to his 12th Chapter about the death of Christ, what hath been said may suffice. Many weighty Considerations of the *Death of Christ* in this whole discourse, I confesse are omitted; and yet more perhaps have been *delivered*, then by our Adversaries occation hath been administred unto. But this businesse is the very *Center* of the New Covenant, and cannot sufficiently be weighed. God assisting, a farther attempt will ere long be made, for the *briefe stating* all the severall concernements of it. §. 28.

CHAP. XXXI.

Of Election, and Universall Grace: Of the Resurrection of Christ from the Dead.

MR *Biddles* Intention in this 13th Chapter, being to decry Gods *Eternall Election*, finding himselfe *destitute* of any *Scripture*, that should to the least outward appearance speak to his purpose, he deserts the *way* and *method* of procedure *imposed* on §. 1.

on himselfe, and in the very Entrance falls into a *Dispute* against it, with such Arguments as the Texts of Scripture after mentioned, give not the least colour or countenance unto. Not that from me he incurres any *blame*, for using any Arguments whereby he supposeth he may further or promote his Cause, is this spoken; but having at the *Entrance* professed against such a *proceedure*, he ought not upon any necessity, to have transgressed the Law, which to himselfe he had prescribed. But as the matter stands, he is to be heard to the full, in what he hath to offer Thus then he proceeds.

§. 2. Q. *Those Scriptures which you have already alleadged, when I enquired for whom Christ died, intimate the universality of Gods Love to men: yet forasmuch as this is a point of the greatest importance, without the knowledge and beliefe whereof, we cannot have any true and solid ground of coming unto God, (because if he from eternity intended good only to a few, and those few are not set downe in the Scriptures, (which were written, that we through the comfort of them might have hope,) no man can certainly, yea probably infer, that he is in the number of those few, the contrary being ten thousand to one more likely) what other clear passages of Scripture have you, which shew, that God, in sending Christ, and proposing the Gospel, aimed not at the salvation of a certain elect number, but of men in general?*

A. Joh. 3. 16,17. Joh. 6. 33. Joh. 4. 42. 1 Joh. 4. 14. Joh. 12. 46,47. Mark. 16 15,16. Col. 1. 22 Col. 1. 18. 1 Tim. 2. 1,2,3. 2 Pet. 3. 9. 2 Cor. 5. 19. 1 Joh. 2. 1,2.

§. 3. That God is good to *all* men, and bountiful, being a *wise, powerfull, liberal* provider for the workes of his hands, in and by innumerable dispensations, and various communications of his *goodnes* to them; and may in that regard, be said to have an *Universall Love* for them all, is granted: But that God loveth all, and every man *alike*, with that *Eternall Love*, which is the fountaine of his giving Christ *for* them, and to them, and all good things with him, is not in the least intimated by any of those *places* of Scripture, where they are expressed for whom Christ *died*; as elsewhere hath been abundantly manifested.

§. 4. 2. It is confessed, that this is a point of the greatest *importance* (that is, of *very great*) without the knowledge and beliefe whereof, we cannot have any True and Solid ground of coming unto God; namely, of the *Love* of God in Christ; but that

to

to *know* the *universality* of his Love is of such *importance*, cannot be proved, unless that can be *numbred* which is *wanting*, and that *weighed* in the ballance which is *not*.

3. We say not, that God from all Eternity *intended good only to a few*, &c. He intended *much good* to *all*, and *every* man in the world, & accordingly in Abundance of variety accomplisheth that his *intention* towards them; to Some in a greater, to Some in a lesser measure, according as seems good to his infinite wisdome and pleasure, for *which all things were made and created*, *Rev.* 4. 11. And for that particular eminent *good of Salvation by Jesus Christ*, for the praise of his Glorious Grace, we do not say, that he intended that from *eternity*, for a *few absolutely* considered; for these will appeare in the issue, to be a *great multitude*, which no man can number, *Rev.* 7. 9. but that in *comparison* of them who shall *everlastingly* come short of his Glory, we say that they are but a *little flock*, yea *few they are that are* chosen, as our Saviour expressly affirmes, what ever M. *B.* be pleased to tell us to the contrary. §. 5.

4. That the granting that they are but *few*, that are *chosen* (though many be *called*) and that before *the foundation of the world* some are chosen to be *holy*, and unblameable in Love through Christ, having their *names written in the Book of Life*, is a *discouragement* to any to come to God, M. *B.* shall perswade us, when he can evince, that the *secret* and eternall *purpose* of Gods discriminating between persons, as to their Eternall conditions, is the great ground and bottome of our *approach* unto God; and not the Truth and *faithfulnesse* of the *promises* which He hath given, with his *holy* and righteous commands. The *issue* that lyes before them, who are commanded to draw *nigh* to God, is, not whether they are *Elected* or no, but whether they will *believe* or no; God having given them Eternall, and unchangeable Rules; *He that Believes shall be saved, and he that believes not, shall be damned*, though no mans name be written in the Scripture, he that *believes* hath the *Faith* of Gods veracity, to assure him, that he shall be saved. It is a most vaine Surmisall, that as to that obedience which God requires of us, there is any obstruction laid, by this consideration, that they *are but few* which are *chosen*. §. 6.

5. This is indeed the only true and solid ground of *coming* unto God by Christ, that God hath *infallibly* conjoyned *Faith* §. 7.

and *Salvation*, so that whosoever *believes* shall be *saved*; neither doth the granting of the pretended *universality of Gods Love*, afford *any other ground* whatever; and this is not in the least shaken or *impaired*, by the effectuall Love and Purpose of God, for the Salvation of Some. And if M. B. hath any other *true* and *solid* ground of encouraging men to come to God by Christ, besides, and beyond this, which may not on one account or other, be educed from it, or resolved into it, (I meane of Gods command and promise) I do here *begge* of him to acquaint me with it, and I shall give him more *thankes* for it, if I live to see it done, then as yet I can perswade my selfe to do, on the account of *all* his other *labours* which I have seen.

§. 8. 6. We say, though God hath *chosen some* only to Salvation by Christ, yet that the names of those *some* are not expressed in Scripture; the doing whereof would have been *destructive* to the main end of the Word, the Nature of Faith, and all the *Ordinances* of the Gospell; yet God having declared, that whosoever *believeth* shall be saved, there is sufficient ground for *all* and *every man* in the World, to whom the Gospell is *Preached*, to come to God by Christ; and other ground there is none, nor can be offered by the Assertors of the *pretended universality* of Gods Love. Nor is this proposition, *he that believes shall be saved*, founded on the *universality* of Love pleaded for, but the Sufficiency of the meanes, for the Accomplishment of what is therein Asserted: namely the *blood of Christ*, *who* is believed on.

§. 9. Now because M. *B.* expresseth, that the end of his Asserting this *Universality of Gods Love*, is to decry his *Eternall purpose* of Election; it being confessed, that between these two there is an *inconsistency*; without entring farre into that *Controversy*, I shall briefly shew what the Scripture speaks to the *latter*, and how remote the places mentioned by M *B.* are, from giving countenance to the *former*, in the sence wherein by him who Asserts it it is understood.

§. 10. For the *first*, me thinks a little respect and Reverence to that Testimony of our Saviour, *many are called, but few are chosen*, might have detained this *Gentleman* from asserting with so much *confidence*, that the perswasion of Gods *choosing but a few*, is an *obstruction* of mens coming unto God. Though he looks upon our blessed Saviour, as a *meer man*, yet I hope, he takes him

him for a *true man*, and one that *taught the way of God aright*. But a little farther to cleare this matter.

§. 11. 1. *Some* are chosen from Eternity, and are under the purpose of God, as to the *good* mentioned. 2. Those *some*, are *some* only, not *All*: and therefore as to the *good* intended, there is not an *Universall Love* in God, as to the *objects* of it, but such a *distinguishing* one as is spoken against. *Eph.* 1.4,5. *According as hee hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the World, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in Love: having Predestinated us to the adoption of Children by Jesus Christ to himselfe, according to the good pleasure of his will.* Here are *some chosen*, and consequently an intention of God concerning them, expressed; and this from Eternity, or before the *foundation of the World*, and this to the *Good of Holinesse, Adoption, Salvation*; and this is *only* of *some*, and not of *all* the World, as the whole tenour of the Discourse being referred to *Believers*, doth abundantly manifest.

§. 12. Rom. 8. 28,29,30. *And we know, that all things work together for good, to them that are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Sonne, that he might be the first borne amongst many brethren: Moreover, whom he did Predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified.* The *good* here *intended* is *Glory*, that the Apostle closes withall; *Whom he justified, them he also glorified.* The *meanes* of that *End*, consists in *vocation* and *justification*: The persons to be made partakers of this end, are *not all* the world, but the *called according to his purpose*; the designation of them so distinguished, to the end expressed, is from the *purpose, foreknowledge*, and *predestination* of God, (that is) his everlasting intention. Were it another man, with whom we have to doe, I should wonder that it came into his mind, to *deny* this Eternall intention of God towards some for good; but nothing is strange from the *Gentleman* of our present contest. They are but *some* which are *ordained to Eternall life*, *Acts* 13.48. but *some*, that are *given to Christ*, *Joh.* 17.6. *A remnant according to Election*, *Rom* 11.5. one being *chosen*, when *another* was rejected, before *they were borne, or had done either good or evill, that the purpose of God, according to Election might stand*, *Rom* 9.11,12. and those who attaine salvation, are *chosen* thereunto, through *sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth*, 2 *Thes.* 2.13. All that is in-

tended by them, whom M. *B.* thinketh to load with the *opinion* he rejects, is but *what* in these and many other places of Scripture, is abundantly revealed. God from *all Eternity*, according to the *purpose of his own will*, or the purpose which is according to *Election*, hath chosen *some*, and appointed them to the *obtaining* of *life* and Salvation by Christ, to the prayse of his glorious Grace. For the *number* of these, be they *few* or *more*, in comparison of the rest of the World, the Event doth manifest.

§. 3. Yet farther to evidence that this *purpose* of God, or *intention* spoken of, is *peculiar* and distinguishing, there is Expresse mention of *another sort* of men, who are *not thus chosen*, but lye under the *purpose* of God, as to a contrary Lot and condition. *The Lord hath made all things for himselfe, yea even the wicked for the day of evill*, Prov. 16.4. They are persons, *whose names are not written in the Lambs book of Life*, Rev. 13 8. *Being of old ordained to condemnation*, Jude 4. being as *naturall brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 12. And therefore the Apostle distinguisheth *all men* into those who *are appointed to wrath*, and those who are appointed *to the obtaining of life* by Jesus Christ, 1 *Thess.* 5 9. An instance of which eternally discriminating purpose of God, is given in *Jacob* and *Esau*, *Rom* 9. 11, 12. which *way*, and procedure therein of God, the Apostle *vindicates* from all appearance of *unrighteousnesse*, and stops the Mouths of all Repiners against it, from the *Soveraignty*, and absolute Liberty of his Will, in dealing with *all the sonnes of men* as he pleaseth, *v.* 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. Concluding that in opposition to them, whom God hath made vessells of mercy, prepared unto Glory; there are also *vessells of Wrath fitted to destruction*, v. 22, 23.

§. 14. Moreover in all eminent Effects and *Fruits* of Love, in all the issues and wayes of it, for the good of, and towards the Sonnes of men, God abundantly manifests, that his *Eternall Love*, that regards the *everlasting* good of men, as it was before described, is *peculiar*, and not *universally* comprehensive of *all*, and every one of man-kind.

In the pursuit of that Love, he gave his Sonne to dye; *For God commendeth his Love to us, in that whilest we were yet sinners, Christ dyed for us*, Rom. 5.8. *Herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Sonne to be the Propitiation for our sinnes*, 1 *Joh.* 4.10. Now though he *dyed* not for the *Jews* only, but for *all*, for the

the *whole World*, or *Men throughout the whole World*, yet that he dyed for *some only* of all sorts throughout the World, even those who are so *chosen*, as is before mentioned, and not for them who are rejected, as was above declared, Himselfe testifies, *Joh.* 17.9. *I pray for them, I pray not for the World, but for them which thou hast given me, thine they were, and thou gavest them me*, v. 6. *And for their sakes I sanctify my selfe*, v. 17. Even as he had said before, that he came to give his life *a ransome for many*, *Mat.* 20. 28. which *Paul* afterwards abundantly confirmes, affirming, that God *redeemed his Church with his own blood*, *Acts* 20. 28. Not the *world*, as contradistinguished from his Church, *nor absolutely*, but his *Church* throughout the World: And to give us a clearer insight into his intendment, in naming the *Church* in this businesse, he tells us, they *are Gods Elect* whom he means, *Rom.* 8. 32,33,34. *He that spared not his Sonne, but delivered him up to death for us all, how shall he not with him, freely give us all things? who shall lay any thing to the charg of Gods Elect? It is God that Justifieth: who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that dyed, yea rather that is risen againe, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.* They are the *Elect* for whom God gave his Sonne, and that out of his Love, which the Apostle eminently sets out *v.* 32. those *to whom with his Sonne* he gives *all things*, and who shall on that account never be separated from him.

Farther to manifest, that this great *fruit* and *effect* of the Love of God, which is extended to the *whole object* of that Love, was not universall. 1. The *Promise* of giving him was not *so*: God promised *Christ* to *all*, for, and to whom he giveth him. The *Lord God of Israel* by him *visited and redeemed* his people, raising up a *horne of Salvation* for them in the house of his servant *David*, as he spake by the *mouth of his holy Prophets, which have been since the world began*, Luk. 1 68,69,70. In the very first *promise* of him, the *seed* of the *Serpent* (as are all Reprobate unbelievers) are *excluded* from any interest therein, Gen 3. 15. And it was renewed again, not to all the world, but to *Abraham & his seed* Gen. 12. 2, 3. Act. 2. 39. Act. 3. 25. And for many Ages, the *Promise* was so apropriated to the *seed of Abraham* Rom. 9. 5 with some few, that joyned themselves to them, *Is.* 56. 3, 4, 5 that the people of God prayed for a *curse* on the residue of the world *Jer.* 10 25. as they which were *strangers from the Covenant of promise*, Eph. 2. 12. §. 15.

12. they belonged not to them, So that God made not a *promise* of Christ to the *universality of mankind*; which sufficiently evinceth, that it was not from an *universall*, but a *peculiar* Love that he was given. Nor

§. 16. 2. When Christ was *exhibited* in the *flesh*, according to the *promise*, was he given to all, but to the *Church*, *Is.* 9. 6. neither *really* as to their good; nor *ministerially* for the *promulgation* of the Gospell to any, but to the *Jewes*. And therefore when he *came to his own*, though his *own received him not*, Joh 1. 11. yet as to the *ministry* which he was to accomplish, he professed he was not *sent but to the lost sheep of Israel*; and gives order to them whom he sent forth to preach in his own life time, not to go into the *way of the Gentiles*, *nor to enter into any City of the Samaritans*, Mat. 10. 5 yea when he had *been lifted up*, to draw all men to him, *Joh.* 3. 14. and *chap.* 12. 32. and being Ascended had broken down the *partition wall*, and tooke away all distinction of *Jew* and *Gentile*, *circumcision* and *uncircumcision*, having dyed not only for that *nation of the Jewes* (for the remnant of them acording to the election of grace, *Rom.* 11.) but that he *might gather together in one the Children of God* that were scattered abroad *Joh.* 11. 52. whence the *language* and *expressions* of the Scripture as to the *people of God* are changed, and in stead of *Judah* and *Israel*, they are expressed by the *world* Joh 3. 16. the *whole world*, 1 Joh. 2. 1, 2. and *all men*, 1 Tim. 4. 6. in opposition to the *Jews* only, *some* of *all sorts* being now taken into Grace and favour with God; yet neither then doth he doe what did remaine, for the full administration of the Covenant of Grace towards all; namely, the pouring out of his Spirit with efficacy of power to bring them into subjection to *him*; but still carries on, (though in a greater extent and latitude) a worke of *distinguishing Love*, *taking* some and *refusing* others. So that being *exalted*, *and made a Prince and a Saviour*, he gives not repentance to all the world, but to them whom he redeemed to God by his blood, out of every *kindred and tongue*

§. 17. *and people and Nation*, Rev. 5. 9.

It appeares then, from the consideration of this *first* most eminent *effect* of the love of God, in all the concernements of it, that that *Love*, which is the foundation of all the grace and Glory, of all the Spirituall and Eternall good things, whereof the sonnes of men are made partakers, is not *universall*, but *peculiar* and *distinguishing*. 2.

M. *Biddle* being to prove his former Assertion of the universallity of Gods Love, mentions sundry places, where God is said to love the world, and to send his Sonne to be the *Saviour of the world*, Joh. 3. 16, 17. John 6. 33. John 4. 42. 1 John 4. 14. John 12, 46, 47. 1 John 2 1, 2. The reason of which expression the Reader was before acquainted with. The benefits of the death of Christ being now no more to be *confined* to one *Nation*, but promiscuously to be imparted to the *Children*, that were scattered abroad *throughout the world* in every *kindred, tongue*, and *Nation* under Heaven, the word, *world*, being used to signify men living in the *world*, sometimes *more*, sometimes *fewer*, *seldome* or never, *All* (unlesse a distribution of them into severall sorts comprehensive of the universality of mankind be subjoyned) that word is used to expresse them, who in the intention of God and Christ are to be made partakers of the benefits of his *mediation*. Men of all sorts throughout the world, being now admitted thereunto: as was before asserted. §. 18.

2. The *benefit* of *Redemption* being thus grounded upon the principle of *peculiar*, not *universall* Love, whom doth God reveale his will concerning it unto? and whom doth he call to the participation thereof? If it be equally provided for all, out of the same love, it is all the *Reason in the world* that all should *equally* be called to a participation thereof, or at least so be *called*, as to have it made known unto them. For a *Physitian* to pretend that he hath provided a *Soveraigne Remedy* for all the *sick* persons in a City, out of an *equall Love* that he beares to them all, and when he hath done, takes care that some few know of it, whereby they may come and be healed, but leaves the rest in utter ignorance of any such provision that he hath made, will he be thought to deale *sincerely* in the profession that he makes of doing of this, out of an *equall* love to them all? Now not only for the space of almost 4000 yeares did God suffer incomparably the greatest part of the whole world, to *walke in their own ways, not calling them to repent* Act. 14. 16. *winking* at that long time of their ignorance, wherein they worshiped *stocks, stones*, & Divels; all that while making *known his word unto Iacob his statutes and judgements unto Israel, not dealing so with any Nation*, whereby they knew not his judgements, *Psal.* 147. 19, 20. So in the pursuit of his *Eternal Love*, calling a *few*, only in com- §. 19.

pariſon leaving the *bulk* of mankind in ſinne, without *hope or God* in the world, *Eph.*2.12. but even alſo ſince the giving out of a Commiſſion and expreſſe command, not to confine the preaching of Word, & calling of men, to *Iudæah*, but to go into all the world and to preach the Goſpell to *every Creature* Mark.16.15. whereupon it is ſhortly after ſaid, to be *preached to every creature under Heaven*, Col. 1. 22. the Apoſtle thereby *warning every man and teaching every man, that they might preſent every man to Ieſus Chriſt* Col.1.28 namely, of all thoſe to whom he came and *preached*, not the *Iewes* only, but of *all ſorts* of men *under Heaven*, and that on this ground, that God would have *all men to be ſaved and come to the knowledg of the truth* 1 Tim2.3,4. be they of what ſort they will, *Kings, Rulers, and all under authority*; yet even to this very day, many whole Nations, great and numerous ſit in darkeneſſe and in the ſhaddow of death, having neither in their *own* dayes, nor in the dayes of their *forefathers*, ever been made partakers of the *glorious Goſpell* of Jeſus Chriſt, whereby alone *life* and immortality are brought to light, and men are made partakers of the love of God in them. So that yet we have not the leaſt evidence of the *univerſall* Love pleaded for. Yea

§. 20. 3. Whereas to the effectuall bringing of men *dead in treſpaſſes and ſinnes* to a participation of any ſaving ſpirituall effect of the love of God in Chriſt, beſides the promulgation of the *Goſpell* and the *Law* thereof, which conſiſteth in the infallible connexion of *Faith and Salvation* according to the *tenour of it*, Math 16.16. *He that believeth ſhall be ſaved*; which is accompanyed with Gods command to believe, wherein he declares his *will* for their Salvation, upon the termes propoſed, approving the obedience of Faith, and giving aſſurance of Salvation thereupon, 1 *Tim.*2.1,2,3,4. there is moreover required the Operation of God by his Spirit with power; to evince that all this *diſpenſation* is managed by *peculiar diſtinguiſhing love*, this is not *granted* to *all*, to whom the *commanding* and *approving* word doth come, but only to them who are the *called* according to his purpoſe, *Rom.* 8.28. that is, to them who are *predeſtinated* v.30. for them he calls, ſo as to *Iuſtify* and *glorify* them thereupon.

§. 21. 4. Not then to inſiſt on any other particular effects of the Love of God, as *Sanctification, Iuſtification, Glorification*; this in generall may be affirmed, that there is not any one good thing what-

whatsoever, that is proper and peculiar to the Covenant of Grace, but it proceeds from a distinguishing Love, and an intention of God towards some only therein.

§. 22. 5. It is true, that God *inviteth many* to Repentance, and *earnestly inviteth* them by the means of the word, which he affords them, to turne from their evill wayes, of whom all the *individuals* are not converted, as he dealt with the *house of Israel* (not all the world, but) those who had his *word and ordinances* Ezek. 18.31,32. affirming that it is not for his *pleasure*, but *for their sinnes*, that they dye; but that this manifests an *universal* Love in God in the way spoken of, or any thing more then the *connexion of Repentance* and Acceptation with God, with his legall Approbation of turning from sinne, there is no matter of proofe to evince.

§. 23. 6. Also, he is not *willing* that any should perish, but that *all* should come to Repentance, 2 *Pet.* 3.9. even *all* those towards whom he exercises *patience* and long suffering for that end, (which, as the Apostle there informes, is to *us ward*) that is, to *Believers* of whom he is speaking. To them also it is said, that he doth not *afflict willingly nor grieve the children of men*, *Lam.* 3. 33. even *his Church* of which the Prophet is speaking: although this also may be extended to all; God never afflicting or grieving men, but it is for some other Reason and cause, then meerly his own will; their destruction being of themselves. *David* indeed tells us, that the *Lord is gratious, full of compassion, slow to anger and of great mercy, that the Lord is good to all and his tender mercyes are over all his workes* Psal. 145.8,9. But he tells us withall, whom he intends by the *all* in this *place*, even the generation which *prayse his workes and declare his mighty acts*, v. 4. those who abundantly *utter the memory* of *his great goodnesse, and sing of his Righteousnesse*, v. 7. or his Saints, as he expressly calls them *v.* 10. The word he there mentions, is the word of the Kingdom of *Christ* over all, wherein the *tender mercyes* of God are spread abroad, in reference to them that do enjoy them. Not but that God is *good* to all, even to his whole Creation, in the many *unspeakeable* blessings of his providence, wherein he *abounds towards* them in *all goodnesse*, but that is not here intended. So that M. B. hath fruitlessly from these Texts of Scripture, endeavoured to prove an *universality* of Love in God, inconsistent with his *peculiar* Love,

purpose and intention of doing good in the sence declared to some only.

§. 24. And thus have I briefely gone through this Chapter, and *by the way* taken into Consideration *all the Texts* of Scripture, which he there wrests to confirme his figment, On the goodnesse of the Nature of God, of the Goodnesse and Love to all, which he shews in great variety, and severall degrees, in the *dispensation of his Providence* throughout the World, of this universall Love, and what it is in the sence of M. B. and his companions, of its *inconsistency* with the *immutability*, *prescience*, *omnipotence*, *fidelity*, *love*, *mercy*, and *faithfulnesse* of God, this being not a controversy peculiar to *them*, with whom in this *Treatise* I have to do, I shall not farther insist.

§. 25. As I have in the *Preface* to this Discourse given an account of the Rise, and present state of *Socinianisme*, so I thought in this place to have given the Reader an account of the present state of the *Controversy* about Grace, and *Free-will*, and the *Death of Christ*, with especiall reference to the late management thereof amongst the *Romanists*, between the *Molinists* and *Jesuits* on the one side, with the *Jansenians*, or *Bayans* on the other; with the late *Ecclesiasticall* and *Politicall transactions* in *Italy*, *France*, and *Flanders*, in reference thereunto, with an account of the Books lately written on the one side and the other, and my *Thoughts* of them; but finding this Treatise grown utterly beyond my intention, I shall deferre the execution of that *designe* to some other opportunity, if God *think good* to continue my *portion* any longer in the land of the Living.

§. 26. The 14th Chapter of the *Catechist*, is about the *Resurrection of Christ*. What are the *proper fruits* of the Resurrection of Christ, and the benefits we receive thereby, and upon what account our *Justification* is ascribed thereto, whether as the *great* and eminent *confirmation* of the doctrine he taught; or as the *issue*, *pledge*, and *evidence* of the Accomplishment of the work of our Salvation by death, it being impossible for him to be detained thereby, is not here discussed; that which the great designe of this Chapter appears to disprove, is, Christs *raising* himselfe by his *own* power: concerning which this is the Question.

§. 27. *Did Christ rise by his own power, yea did he raise himselfe at all? or was he raised by the power of another? and did another raise him? What*

is

is the perpetuall tenour of the Scripture to this purpose?

In Answer hereunto, many Texts of Scripture are rehearsed, where it is said, that *God raised him from the dead, and that he was raised by the power of God.*

But we have manifested, that M. *B.* is to come to another *reckoning*, before he can make any work of this Argument; *God raised him*, therefore he did not *raise himselfe*: When he hath proved that *he is not God*, let him freely make such an inference and conclusion as this: In the *mean time*, we say, because *God raised him from the Dead*, he raised himselfe; for he is *God over all blessed for ever.*

2. It is true, that Christ is said to be raised by God, taken *personally* for the *Father*, whose joynt Power, with his Own, as that also of the Spirit, was *put forth* in this work of raising *Christ* from the Dead. And for his own *raising himselfe*, if M. *B.* will believe him, this businesse will be put to a short issue: He tells us, that *he laid down his life, that he might take it up againe, no man* (saith he) *taketh it from me, I have power to lay it downe of my selfe, and I have power to take it againe*, Joh. 10. 17, 18. And speaking of the Temple of his Body, He bad the Jews *destroy* it, and, *that he would raise it againe within three daies*: which we believe he did, and if M. *B.* be otherwise minded, we cannot help it. §. 28.

CHAP. XXXII.

Of Justification and Faith.

THIS Chapter, for the *Title* and Subject of it, would require a large & serious consideration; But by M. *Biddles* loose procedure in this businesse, (whom only I shall now attend) we are absolved from any strict inquiry into the whole Doctrine that is concerned herein. Some briefe Animadversions upon his Questions, and suiting of Answers to them, will be all that I shall go forth unto. His first is, §. 1.

Q. *How many sorts of Justification or Righteousnesse are there?*

This Question supposeth *Righteousnesse* and *Justification* to be the same: which is a grosse notion for a *Master of Arts*. Righteousnesse is that which God requires of us, Justification is his Act concerning man, considered as vested or indued with that *Righteousnesse* which he requires: Righteousnesse is the *Qualification* of the person to be Justifyed; Justification the Act of him that Justifies. A mans *legall honesty* in his tryall, is not the sentence of the *Judge* pronouncing him so to be, to all ends and purposes of that honesty. But to his Question M. *B.* answers from *Rom.*10.5. *the Righteousnesse which is of the Law*, and *Phil.*3.9. *The Righteousnesse which is of God by Faith.*

§. 3. It is true, there is this twofold Righteousnesse that men may be partakers of, a Righteousnes consisting in *exact, perfect* & *compleat* obedience yeilded to the Law, which God required of man under the Covenant of workes, and the Righteousnesse which is of *God* by *Faith*, of which afterwards: Answerable hereunto there *is*, hath *been*, or may *be*, a twofold *Justification*: the one consisting in Gods *declaration* of *him*, who performes all that he requires in the Law, to be Just and Righteous, and his acceptation of him according to the Promise of Life, which he annexed to the obedience, which of man he did require. And the other Answers that *Righteousnesse* which shall afterward be described. Now though these two *Righteousnesses* agree in their generall end, which is Acceptation with God, and a reward from him, according to his Promise, yet in their own *natures*, causes, and manner of attaining, they are altogether *inconsistent* & destructive of each other; So that it is utterly impossible they should ever meet in and upon the same person.

§. 4. For the description of the *first*, M. *B.* gives it in answer to this Question.

How is the Righteousnesse which is of the Law described?

Ans. *Moses describeth the Righteousnesse which is of the Law, that the man that doth these things shall live by them*, Rom.10.5.

This description is full and compleat. *The doing of the things of the Law*, or all the things the law requireth, to this end that a man may live by them, or a *keeping of the commandements* that we *may enter into life*, makes up this Righteousnesse of the Law. And whatsoever any man doth, or may do, that is required by the Law of God, (as *believing*, trusting in him, and the like,) to

this

this end, that he may live thereby, that it may be his *Righteouſneſſe* towards God, that thereupon he may be Juſtifyed, it belongs to this Righteouſneſſe of the Law here deſcribed by *Moſes*. I ſay whatever is performed by man in Obedience to any *Law* of God to this end, that a man may *live thereby*, and that it may be the mater of his *Righteouſneſſe*, it belongs to the Righteouſneſſe here deſcribed: and of this we may have ſome uſe, in the conſideration of M.B's enſuing Queries. He addes,

What ſpeaketh the Righteouſneſſe which is of Faith? §. 5.

A. Ro. 10.8,9. *The word is nigh thee even in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that is, the word which we preach, that if thou ſhalt confeſſe with thy mouth the Lord Ieſus, and ſhalt believe in thine heart that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.*

The Object of Juſtifying Faith, namely, *Ieſus Chriſt as dying*, and *riſing againe* from the dead to the obtaining of *Eternall Redemption*, and *bringing in* Everlaſting righteouſneſſe, is in theſe words deſcribed. And this is that which the Righteouſneſſe of Faith is ſaid to ſpeake; becauſe Chriſt dying and riſing is our Righteouſneſſe. He is *made* ſo to us of God, and being under the conſideration of his death, and Reſurrection received of us by Faith, we are Juſtifyed.

His next queſtion is, §. 6.

In the Iuſtification of a Believer is the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt imputed to him, or is his own Faith counted for Righteouſneſſe?

Anſ. Rom. 4.5. *His Faith is counted for Righteouſneſſe.*

What M.B. intends by Faith, and what by accounting of it for Righteouſneſſe, we know full well. The *Iuſtification* he intends by theſe expreſſions is the plaine old *Phariſaicall* Juſtification, and no other: as ſhall elſewhere be abundantly manifeſted. For the preſent, I ſhall only ſay, that M *Biddle* doth moſt ignorantly oppoſe the *imputing* of the Righteouſneſſe of Chriſt to us, and the accounting of our Faith for Righteouſneſſe, as inconſiſtent. It is the accounting of our Faith for Righteouſneſſe, and the Righteouſneſſe of workes that is oppoſed by the Apoſtle. The *Righteouſneſſe* of Faith, and the *Righteouſneſſe* of Chriſt are every way one and the ſame; the one denoting that whereby we receive *it*, and are made partakers of it, the *other* that) which is *received*, and whereby we are Juſtifyed. And indeed there is a perfect inconſiſtency

sistency between the Apostles intention in this expression, *to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifies the ungodly, his Faith is accounted to him for Righteousnesse*, taken with his explication of it, that we are made *partakers of the Righteousnesse of Christ by Faith*, & therein he is made *Righteousnesse to them that believe*, with M. B's interpretation of it, which is (as shall be farther manifested) *to him that worketh and believes on him, that Justifies the righteous his obedience is his righteousnesse.* But of this elsewhere.

§. 7. The next Question and Answer is about *Abraham* and his *Justification*, which being but an *instance* exemplifying what was spoken before, I shall not need to insist thereon. Of his believing on God *only*, our believing *on Christ*, which is *also* mentioned, I have spoken already, and shall not trouble the Reader with repetition thereof.

§. 8. But he farther argues.

Doth not God justifie men because of the full price Christ payd to him in their stead, so that he abated nothing of his right, in that one drop of Christs blood was sufficient to satisfy for a thousand worlds? if not, how are they Saved?

Ans. *Being Justifyed freely*, Rom. 3.24. Eph. 1.17.

That Christ did pay a full *price*, or *ransome* for us & that he did *stand in our stead*, that he was not *bated* any jot of the penalty of the Law, that was due to sinnners, that on this account we are fully acquitted, and that the *forgivenesse of our sinnes* is by the Redemption that is in his blood, hath been already fully and at large evinced; Let M. B. if he please, attempt to evert what hath been spoken to that purpose.

§. 9. The expression about *one drop of Christs blood* is a *fancy*, or imagination of idle Monkes, men ignorant of the Righteousnesse of God, and the whole nature of the *mediation* which our blessed Saviour undertook; wherein they have not the least communion. The close of the Chapter is?

§. 10. *Did not Christ merit Eternall life and purchase the kingdome of Heaven for us?*

Ans. *The gift of God is Eternall Life*, Rom. 6.23. *It is your Fathers good pleasure to give you the Kingdome*, Luk. 12.32.

Eternall life is the gift of God, in opposition to any *merit of ours*, and in respect of his designation of him, who is eternall Life, to be our Mediatour, and purchaser of it; yet that Christ did

not

not therefore obtain by his blood, for us *eternall Redemption* Heb. 9. 12. that he did not purchase us to *himselfe*, Tit. 2. 14. or that the merit of Christ for us, and the *free Grace* of God unto us, are *inconsistent*, our *Catechist* attempts not to prove. Of the reconciliation of Gods purpose, and good *pleasure*, mentioned *Luk.* 12. 32. with the Satisfaction and merit of the Mediatour, I have spoken also at large already.

I have thus briefely passed through this Chapter, although it treateth of one of the most *important* heads of our *Religion*, because (the Lord assisting) I intend the full handling of the Doctrine opposed in it, in a just *Treatise* to that purpose.

CHAP. XXXIII.

Of keeping the Commandements of God: And of Perfection of Obedience, how attaineable in this Life.

THE Title of Chapter 16th in our *Catechist*, is of *Keeping the Commandements, and having an eye to the reward, of perfection in vertue and Godlinesse to be attained; and of departing from Righteousnesse and Faith.* What the man hath to offer on these severall heads, shall be considered in order. His first Question is. §. 1.

Q. *Are the Commandements Possible to be kept?*

Ans. *His Commandements are not grievous*, Joh. 5. 3. *My yoake is easy, and my burthen light*, Math: 11. 30.

1. I presume it is evident to every one, at the first view, that there is very little relation between the *Question* and the *Answer* thereunto suggested. The *inquiry* is of our *strength* & power: the *Answer* speaks to the *nature* of the Commands of God. It never came sure into the mind of any living, that the meaning of this Question, *Are the Commandements possible to be kept?* Is, *is there an absolute impossibility from the nature of the Commands of God themselves that they cannot be kept by any.* Nor did ever any man say so, or can without the greatest Blasphemy against God. But the Question is, what Power there is in Man to keep those Commandements of God; which certainly the Texts insisted on by *M. B.* doe not in the least give an Answer unto. §. 2.

§. 3. 2. He tels us not, in *what state or condition* he supposes that *person* to be, concerning whom the inquiry is made, whether he can *possibly keep the Commandements of God or no*: Whether he speaks of *all men* in generall, or *any* man *indefinitely*, or *restrainedly* of Believers. Nor,

3. Doth he informe us, what he intends by *keeping* the Commands of God? Whether an *exact, perfect*, and every way *compleat* keeping of them, up to the highest *degree* of all things, in all things, Circumstances and Concernements of them: or whether the keeping of them in an *universall sincerity*, accepted before God, according to the tenure of the Covenant of Grace, be intended. Nor,

4. What *Commandements* they are, which he chiefely respects, and under what Consideration: Whether all the Commands of the *Law* of God as such; or whether the Gospell commands of *Faith* and *Love*, which the places from whence he answers do respect. Nor,

5. What he means by the *impossibility* of keeping Gods commands, which he intends to deny; that which is *absolutely* so from the nature of the thing its selfe, or that which is so only in *some respect*, with reference to some certain *state* and Condition of Man.

§. 4. When we know in *what sence* the *Question* is proposed, we shall be enabled to returne an Answer thereunto, which he that hath proposed it here, knew not how to doe: In the mean time, to the thing *its selfe* intended, according to the *light* of the premised Distinctions, we say that *all* the *Commandements* of God, the whole Law is *excellent, pretious*, not *grievous* in its selfe, or its *own Nature*, but admirably expressing the Goodnesse, and Kindnesse, and Holinesse of him that gave it, in Relation to *them* to whom it was given, and can by no means be said, as from it's selfe and upon its own account, to be *impossible* to be kept. Yet,

2. No unregenerate man can possibly keep, that is, hath in himselfe a Power to *keep* any one of all the Commandements of God, as to the *matter* required, and the *manner* wherein it is required. This impossibility is not in the least relating to the *Nature* of the Law, but to the *impotency*, and corruption of the Person lying under it.

3. No man *though regenerate*, can fulfill the Law of God Perfectly

fectly, or *keep all the Commandements* of God, according to the Originall *tenour* of the Law, in all the Parts and Degrees of it; nor ever any man *did so*, since sinne entred into the World; for it is impossible that any *regenerate* man should keep the Commandements of God, as they are the *tenour* of the Covenant of works. If this were otherwise, the Law would not have been made *weake by sinne*, that it should not justify.

4. That it is impossible, that any man though *regenerate*, should by his *own strength* fulfill any *one* of the commands of God, seeing without *Christ we can do nothing*, and it is God who works in us *to will and to doe of his good pleasure*.

5. That to keep the Commandements of God, not as the *tenour of the Covenant of Works*, nor in an absolute perfection of obedience, and correspondency to the Law; but *sincerely* and *uprightly*, unto Acceptation, according to the *tenour of the Covenant of Grace*, and the obedience it requires, through the assistance of the Spirit, and Grace of God, is not only a thing *possible*, but *easy*, *Pleasant*, and *Delightfull*.

Thus we say,

1. That a person *Regenerate* by the Assistance of the Spirit and grace of God, may *keep the Commandements* of God, in yeelding to him, in answer to them, that *sincere obedience*, which in Jesus Christ, according to the tenor of the Covenant of Grace, is required: yea it is to *him* an Easy and Pleasant thing so to doe. §. 5.

2. That an *unregenerate* Person should keep any one of Gods Commandements as he ought, is *impossible*, not from the Nature of Gods Commands, but from his *own state* and Condition.

3. That a Person, though Regenerate, yet being so but in *part*, and carrying about him a *body of Death*, should keep the *Commands of God*, in a perfection of Obedience, according to the Law of the Covenant of Works, is impossible from the condition of a Regenerate man, and not from the *Nature of Gods Commands*. What is it now that M. *B.* opposes? Or what is that he Asserts?

I suppose he declares his mind in his *Lesser Catechisme*, Chap. 7. Q. 1. where he proposes his question in the words of the *Ruler* amongst the Jews; *What good shall a man doe that he may have* §. 6.

eternall life? An Answer of it followes in that of our Saviour, *Math.19.17,18,19. If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandements.*

The intendment of this *inquiry* must be the same with *his* that made it, as his Argument in the whole is; or the Answer of our *Saviour*, is no way suited thereunto: Now it is most evident, that the Inquiry was made according to the principles of the *Pharisees*, who expected Justification by the Works of the Law, according to the *tenour* of a Covenant of Works, to which *presumption* of theirs, our Saviour *suits* his Answer: and seeing they sought to be *justified*, and Saved as it were, *by the Works of the Law*, to the *Law* he sends them. This then being M *B's* sence, wherein he affirmes that it is *possible* to keep the Commandements, so as *for doing good*, and keeping them, to *enter* into life, I shall only remit him, as our Saviour did the *Pharisees* to the *Law*: but yet I shall withall pray, that our mercifull Lord, would not leave him to the *foolish choyce* of his own *darkned heart*, but in his due time, by the *blood of the Covenant*, which yet he *seems* to despise, send him forth of the *Prison wherein is no water.*

p. 7. Q. 2. *But though it be possible, to keep the Commandements, yet is it not enough, if we desire and endeavour to keep them; although we actually keep them not? And doth not God accept the Will for the Deed?*

Ans. 1 Cor.7.19. Math.7, 21,24,26. Jam.1.25. Rom.2. 10. Joh.13.17. Luk.11,24. 2 Cor.5.10. Mat.16.27. Revel. 22.21. Mat.19.18,19. In all which places, there is mention of *doing the will of God, of keeping the Commandements of God.*

The aime of this Question, is to take advantage at what hath been delivered by some, not as an ordinary *Rule* for all men to walke by, but as an extraordinary *relief* for some in distresse. When *poore soules* bowed down under the sence of their owne weakenesse, and insufficiency for obedience, and the *exceeding unsuitableness* of their best performances to the *spirituall* and exact perfection of the Law of God, (things which the proud *Pharisees* of the world are unacquainted withal) to support them under their *distresse*, they have been by some directed to the consideration of the *sincerity* that was in their *Obedience*, which they did yeild, and guided to examine that, by their desires and endeavours. Now as this direction is not without a good foundation in the Scripture, *Nehemiah* describing the *Saints* of

God

God by this *character*, that they *desire to feare the name of God*, Neh. 1. 11. and *David* every where professing this, as an eminent property of a Child of God, so they who gave it, were very farre from understanding such *desires*, as may be pretended as a *colour* for sloath, and negligence, to give countenance to the soules and consciences of men in a willing *neglect* of the performance of such dutyes, as they are to presse after; but such they intend, as had adjoyned to them, and accompanying of them, earnest continuall sincere *endeavours* (as M.B. acknowledgeth) to walke before God in all well pleasing, though they could not attaine to that perfection of obedience that is required. And in this case, though we make not application of the particular Rule of accepting *the will for the deed*, to the generall *case*, yet we feare not to say, that this is all the *perfection*, which the best of the Saints of God in this life attaine to, and which according to the *tenour of that Covenant* wherein we now walk with God in Jesus Christ, is accepted. This is all the doing or keeping of the Commandements that is intended in any of the places quoted by M.B. unlesse that last: wherein our Saviour sends that proud *Pharisee*, according to his own principles to the Righteousnesse of the Law which he followed after, but could not attaine. But of this more afterwards. He farther argues,

Though it be not only possible but also necessary to keep the Commandements, yet is it lawfull so to do that we may have a right to eternall Life, and the heavenly inheritance? May we seeke for honour, and glory, and immortality, by well doing? is it the tenour of the Gospell that we should live uprightly in expectation of the hope hereafter? and finally ought we to suffer for the Kingdome of God, and not as some are pleased to mince that matter from the kingdome of God? where are the testimonies of Scripture to this purpose? §. 8.

An. Revel. 22. 14. Rom. 2. 6, 7, 8. Tit. 2. 11, 13. 2 Thess. 1. 5.

Ans. 1. In what sence it is *possible* to keep the Commandements, in what *not*, hath been declared. 2. How it is *necessary* or in what sence, or for what end, M.B. hath not yet spoken, though he supposeth he hath; but we will take it for granted that it is necessary for us so to do; in that sence, and for that End and purpose, for which it is of us required. 3. To allow then the Gentleman the advantage of his Captious proceedure

by a multiplication of *entangled queries*; and to take them in that order wherein they lye.

To the first, *whether we may keep the commandements that we may have right to eternall life.* I say 1. keeping of the Commandements in the sence acknowledged may be looked on in respect of Eternall life, either as the cause procuring it, or as the means conducing to it. 2. A right to eternall life may be considered in respect of the Rise and Constitution of it, or of the *present* evidence & last enjoyment of it. There is a twofold Right to the Kingdome of Heaven; a Right of *desert* according to the tenour of the Covenant of works; & a right of *promise* according to the tenour of the *Covenant of Grace.* I say then, that it is not *lawfull*, that is, it is not the way, Rule, & Tenour of the Gospell, that we should do or keep the commandements, so that that doing or keeping should be the cause *procuring* & *obtaining* an *original* Right, as to the rise and constitution of it, or a Right of desert to eternall Life. This is the pefect tenour of the Covenant of *works* and Righteousnesse of the Law; *do this and live*; if a man do the *works of the Law he shall live thereby*; and if thou will *enter into life, keep the Commandements*; which if there be any Gospell or new Covenant confirmed in the blood of Christ, is antiquated as to its efficacy, and was ever since the entrance of sinne into the world, as being ineffectuall for the bringing of any soule unto God, *Rom.* 8. 3. *Heb.* 8. 11, 12. This if it were needfull, I might confirme with *innumerable* Texts of Scripture, and the transcription of a good part of the *Epistles* of *Paul* in particular. 3. The inheritance which is purchased for us by Christ, & is the Gift of God, plainely excludes all such confidence in keeping the Commandements, as is pleaded for. For my part, I willingly ascribe to obedience any thing that hath a consistency (in reference to eternall life) with the full purchase of Christ, and the *free donation* of God; and therefore I say 4. as a meanes apointed of God, as the *way* wherein we ought to walk, for the coming to, & obtaining of the *Inheritance* so fully purchased and freely given, for the evidencing of the right given us thereto by the blood of Christ, & *giving* actuall admission to the enjoyment of the purchase, and to testify our free acceptation with God, and Adoption on that account, so we ought to do, and *keep the Comandements*, that is, *walke in holinesse*, without

out which none shall see God. This is all that is intended *Re.* 22. 14. Christ speaks not there to Unbelievers, shewing what they must do to be justifyed & saved; but to *redeemed, justifyed, & sanctifyed ons*, shewing them their way of *admission* & the meanes of it to the remaining priviledges of the *purchase* made by his *blood*.

§. 9. His next question is, *May we seeke for honour and glory and immortallity by well-doing?* which words are taken from *Rom.* 2. 7, 8.

I answer, the words there are used in a law sence, and are declarative of the Righteousnes of God, in rewarding the *keepers* of the Law of nature, or the Morall Law, according to the Law of the Covenant of Workes. This is evident from the whole designe of the Apostle in that place, which is to convince all men, *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, of sinne, against the Law; and the impossiblity of the obtainig the Glory of God thereby. So in particular from *v.* 10. where Salvation is annexed to *works*, in the very termes wherein the Righteousnesse of the Law is expressed by M. B. in the Chapter of *Justification*; and in direct opposition whereunto, the Apostle sets up the Righteousnesse of the Gospell *Chap.* 1. 17. *Chap.* 3. & 4. But yet translate the words into a *Gospel sence*, consider welldoing as the way appointed for us to walke in, for the obtaining of the end mentioned, and consider *Glory, Honour*, and *immortallity*, as a reward of our obedience, purchased by Christ, and *freely* promised of God on that account, and I say we may, we ought *by patient continuing in well doing, seeke for glory honour and immortality*; that is, it is our duty to abide in the way, and use of the meanes prescribed, for the obtaining of the *inheritance* purchased and promised: but yet this, with the *limitations* before in part mentioned. As 1. that of our selves we can do no good; 2. that the ability we have to do good, is purchased for us by Christ. 3. This is not so full in this life, as that we can perfectly, to all degrees of perfection, do good, or yeild obedience to the law. 4. That which by grace we do yeild and performe, is not the *cause procuring* or meriting of that inheritance: which 5. as the grace whereby we obey, is fully purchased for us by Christ, and freely bestowed upon us by God.

His next is, *Is it the tenour of the Gospell that we should live uprightly in expectation of the hope hereafter?* doubtlesse; neither shall I need to give any answer at all to this part of the inquiry but what lyes

lyes in the words of the Scripture, produced for the proofe of our *Catechists* intention. *The Grace of God that bringeth Salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodlinesse and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and Godly in this present world; looking for the blessed hope and a glorious appearance of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ* Tit. 2. 11, 12, 13. Christ the *great God our Saviour*, having promised an *inheritance* to us with himselfe, at his glorious appearance, raiseth up our hearts with an *hope and Expectation* thereof; his Grace or the Doctrine of it, teacheth us to performe all manner of holinesse, and righteousnesse all our dayes; and this is the tenour and law of the Gospell, that so we do; but what this is to M. *Biddles* purpose I know not.

§. 11. His last attempt is upon the exposition of some (I know not whom) who have minced the doctrine *so small* (it seemes) that he can find no relish in it; saith he, *finally ought we to suffer for the Kingdome of God, or from the Kingdome of God?* his answer is 2 *Thess.* 1. 5. *That you may be counted worthy of the Kingdome of God, for which you also suffer.* I confesse *suffering from the kingdome of God*, is something an uncouth expression; and those who have used it to the Offence of this *Gentleman*, might have more *commodiously* delivered what they did intend. But the *Kingdome* of God being sometimes taken for that rule of Grace which Christ hath in the hearts of Believers, and thereupon being said to be within us, and the word, *from*, denoting the *principle of obedience* in suffering, there is a truth in the expression, and that very consistent with *suffering for the Kingdome* of God, which here is opposed unto it. To suffer *from the kingdome of God*, is no more, then to be *enabled* to suffer from a *principle of grace* within us, by which Christ beares rule in our hearts; and in this sense we say that no man can do or suffer any thing so, as it shall be acceptable unto God, but it must be from the *Kingdome* of God: for they that are in the *flesh* cannot please God, even their *Sacrifices* are an *abomination* to him. This is so farre from hindring us, as to suffering for the Kingdome of God, that is, to endure persecution for the profession of the Gospell, (*for* in the place of the Apostle cited denotes the procuring occasion, not finall cause) that without it so we cannot do: and so the minced matter hath I hope a savory relish recovered unto it againe.

§. 12. His next questions are. 1. *Have you any examples of keeping the commandments*

Commandements under the Law? what saith David of himself? Psal. 18. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. And

2. *Have you any example under the Gospell?* 1 Joh. 3. 10. because we keepe his commandements.

All this trouble is M. B. advantaged to make from the ambiguity of this expression of *keeping the Commandements*; we know full well what *David* saith of his *Obedience*; and what he said of his sinnes; so that we know his *keeping of the Commandements* was in respect of *sincerity*, as to *all* the Commandements of God, and all the parts of them: but not as to his perfection in keeping all or any of them. And he who says *we keep his Commandements*, says also, that if we *say we have no sinne, we lye, and deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us.*

He addes, *Have you not examples of the Choysest Saints who obeyed God in hope of the reward both before, under, and after the Law?* Heb. 11. 8, 9, 10, 24, 25, 26. Heb. 12. 12. Tit. 1. 1, 2. §. 13.

To obey in hope of Eternall Life, is either to yeeld obedience, in hope of obtaining Eternall life, as a reward *procured by*, or *proportioned* to that *obedience*; and so no Saint of God since the Fall of *Adam*, did yeeld obedience to God, or *ought* to have so done: or to *obey in hope of Eternall life*, is to carry along with us, in our Obedience, an *hope* of the enjoyment of the *promised inheritance* in due time, and to be *encouraged*, and strengthened in Obeying thereby. Thus the Saints of God walke with God, in hope, & Obedience at this day; and they always did so from the beginning: They have hope in, and with their Obedience, of that whereunto their obedience leads, which was Purchased for them by Christ.

Q. Doe not the Scriptures intimate that Christians may attaine to perfection of vertue and Godlinesse, and that it is the intention of God and Christ, and his Ministers, to bring them to this pitch? rehearse the Texts to this effect. §. 14.

Ans. Eph. 1. 4.

Not to make long Work of that, which is capable of a speedy dispatch; by *vertue and Godlinesse*, M. B. understands that *universall Righteousnesse* and *Holinesse*, which the Law requires; by *perfection* in it, an Absolute, Compleat Answerablenesse to the *Law*, in that Righteousnesse and Holinesse, both as to the *matter* wherein they consist, and the *manner how* they are to be performed;

formed; that *Christians* may Attaine, expresses a Power that is reducible into *Act*: So that the *intention* of God and the Ministers, is not, that they should be *pressing* on towards Perfection, which it is confessed, we are to doe, whilest we live in this World, but *actually* in this Life, to bring them to an enjoyment of it. In this sence, we deny that any man in this life, *may attaine to a perfection of vertue and Godlinesse*; For,

1. All our works are done out of *Faith*, 1 *Tim.* 1.5. *Gal.* 5.6. now this *Faith*, is the *Faith* of the forgivenesse of Sinnes by Christ, and *that purifieth the Heart*, *Acts* 15.8,9. But the *works that proceed from Faith*, for the *forgivenesse of sinnes* by Christ, cannot be *perfect absolutely* and in themselves, because in the *very rise* of them, they expect Perfection and compleatnesse from another.

§. 15. 2. Such as is the Cause, such is the Effect; but the *principle* or Cause of the Saints obedience in this life is *imperfect*; so therefore is their obedience. That our *sanctification* is imperfect in this life, the Apostle witnesseth, 2 *Cor.* 4.16. 1 *Cor.* 13.9.

§. 16. 3. Where there is *flesh* and *Spirit*, there is not *perfection*: for the *flesh* is contrary to the Spirit, from whence our *perfection* must proceed if we have any: but there is *flesh* and *Spirit* in all Believers, whilest they live in this World, *Gal.* 5.17. *Rom.* 7.14.

§. 17. 4. They that are not *without sinne*, are not *absolutely* perfect; for to be Perfect, is to have *no* sinne: but the Saints in this *life* are not *without* sinne, 1 *Ioh.* 1.8. *Matth.* 6.12. *Iames* 3.2. *Eccles.* 7.21. *Isa.* 64.6. but to what end should I multiply Arguments, or Testimonies to this purpose? If all the Saints of God have acknowledged themselves *sinners* all their dayes, alwayes deprecated the Justice of God, and appeal'd to *Mercy* in their triall before God, if all our *perfection* be by the *blood of Christ*, and we are *justified* not by the works of the Law, but Grace, this *pharisaicall figment* may be rejected as the *foolish* imagination of men *ignorant of the Righteousnesse of God*, and of him who is *the end of the Law for righteousnesse to them that do Believe.*

§. 18. But take *perfection* as it is often used in the Scripture, and ascribed to men, of whom yet many great and eminent failings are recorded (which certainly were inconsistent with perfection absolutely considered) and so it denotes two things. 1. *Sincerity* in opposition to *Hypocrisie*: And 2. *Universality*, as to all the

the parts of obedience, in oppoſition to *partiality*, and halveing with God: So we ſay, perfection is not only *attaineable* by the Saints of God, but is in *every one* of them; but this is not ſuch a perfection, as conſiſts in a *point*, which if it deflects from, it *ceaſes* to be perfection; but ſuch a condition as admits of ſeverall degrees, all lying in a tendency to that *perfection* ſpoken of; and the men of this perfection, are ſaid to be *perfect* or *upright* in the *Scripture*, *Pſal.*37.14. *Pſal.*119.100. &c.

Not then to inſiſt on all the places mentioned by M. *B.* in particular, they may all be referr'd to Foure heads; 1. Such as mention an *unblameableneſſe* before God in Chriſt, which argues a *Perfection* in Chriſt, but only *ſincerity* in us; Or 2. Such as mention a perfection in *fieri*, but not in *facto eſſe*, as we ſpeak; a *preſſing towards perfection*, but not a *perfection obtained*, or here obtainable; Or 3. A *comparative perfection* in reſpect of others; or a Perfection of *Sincerity*, accompanied with Univerſality of obedience, conſiſtent with Indwelling ſinne, and many tranſgreſſions. The application of the ſeverall places mentioned to theſe Rules, is *Eaſy*, and lyes at *hand*, for any that will take the pains to Conſider them. He proceeds. §. 19.

If Workes be ſo neceſſary to Salvation, as you have before ſhewed from the Scripture, how cometh it to paſſe that Paul *ſaith, We are juſtified by Faith without Works? meant he to exclude all Good works whatſoever, or only thoſe of the Law? How doth he explain himſelfe?* Rom.2.2,28. *We are juſtified by Faith, without the works of the Law.* §. 20.

A. How, and in what ſence *workes are neceſſary to Salvation*, hath been declared, and therefore I remit the Reader to its proper place.

2. A full Handling of the Doctrine of *Juſtification*, was *waved* before, and therefore I ſhall not here take it up, but content my ſelfe with a *briefe* removall of M. *B's* attempts to deface it. I ſay then,

3. That *Paul* is very troubleſome to all the *Phariſees* of this Age, who therefore turne themſelves a thouſand ways to eſcape the Authority of the Word and Truth of God, (by him fully declared and vindicated againſt their fore-fathers) labouring to fortify themſelves with diſtinctions, which as they ſuppoſe (but falſely) their Predeceſſors were ignorant of; *Paul* then, this *Paul*, denyes all *works*, all *works* whatſoever, to

have any share in our *Justification* before God, as the *matter* of our Righteousnesse, or the Cause of our justification. For,

§. 21. 1. He excludes all *Works of the Law*, as is confessed. The works of the Law, are the works, that the Law requires. Now there is *no work* whatever that is good or acceptable to God, but it is required by the Law; so that in excluding *works of the Law*, he excludes all Works whatever.

2 He expressly excludes all Works done by vertue of *Grace*, and *after Calling*; which (if any) should be exempted from being *works of the Law*: For though the Law requires them, yet they are not done from a *principle*, nor to *an end* of the Law; these *Paul* excludes expressly, *Ephes.* 8. 9. 10. *By Grace we are Saved, not of Workes*; what Workes? those which *we are created unto in Christ Jesus.*

3. All Works, that are Works, are Excluded expressly, and set in an opposition to *Grace* in this businesse, *Rom.* 1. 5, 6. *If it be of Grace, it is no more of Works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of Works, it is no more Grace, otherwise Works is no more Works.* and *Rom.* 4 3, 4, 5.

4. All Works are excluded, that take off from the Absolute Freedome of the justification of sinners, by the Redemption that is in Christ, *Rom.* 3. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. Now this is not Peculiar to any one sort of Works, or to any one Work, more then to another, as might be demonstrated; but this is not a place for so great a Work, as the thorow handling of this Doctrine requires. He addes,

§. 22. *Can you make it appeare from else-where, that* Paul *intended to exclude from justification, only the perfect Works of the Law, which leave no place for either Grace or Faith, and not such Works as include both, and that by a justifying Faith he meant a working Faith, and such an one as is accompanied with Righteousnesse?*

Ans. Eph. 2. 8, 9, 10. Rom. 4. 3, 4, 5. Rom. 11, 5, 6. Rom. 4. 14, 15, 16. Gal. 5. 6. Rom. 1. 17, 18,

A. Still *Paul* and his Doctrine troublehema n, as they did his Predeceessors. That *Paul* excluded all Works of what sort soever, from our justification, as precedaneous causes or conditions thereof, was before Declared. M. *B.* would only have it, that the *perfect Works of the Law* only are excluded, when if any Works take place in our justification with God, those only may be.

be admitted; for certainly, if we are Justified, or pronounced Righteous for our Works, it must be for the Works that are Perfect, or else the judgement of God is not according to Truth. Those only it seems are excluded, that only may be accepted; and imperfect workes are Substituted, as the matter of a perfect Righteousnesse; without which, none shall stand in the presence of God. But,

2. There is not one Text of Scripture mentioned by M. B. whence he aimes to evince his Intention, but expresly denyes what he asserts; and sets all Works whatever in opposition to Grace, and excludes them *all*, from any place in our justification before God: So that the man seems to have been *infatuated* by his *Pharisaisme*, to give direction for his own condemnation. Let the places be considered by the Reader.

3. The *Grace* mentioned, as the *Cause* of our justification, is not the *Grace* of God, bringing forth good Works in us, which stand thereupon in opposition to the works of the Law, as done in the strength of the Law, but the *free Favour* and *Grace* of God towards us in Christ Jesus, which excludes *all Works* of ours whatever, as is undeniably manifest, *Rom.* 4. 4. Chap. 11. 5, 6. §. 23.

4. It is true, *Justifying Faith is a Living Faith*, purging the Heart, working by Love, and bringing forth fruits of obedience; but that its Fruits of *Love* and *Good Works* have any *causall influence* into our justification, is most false. We are justified *freely* by *Grace*, in opposition to all Fruits of Faith whatever, which God hath ordained us to bring forth: That Faith whereby we are justified, will never be without works, yet we are not Justified by the *Works* of it, but freely by the *Blood of Christ*; *how*, and in what sence we are justified by *Faith* its selfe, what part, office, and place, it hath in our Justification, its consistency in its due place and Office, with Christs being our *Righteousnesse*, and its receiving of Remission of sinnes, which is said to be our *blessednesse*, shall elsewhere (God assisting) be manifested.

What then hath M. B. yet remaining to plead in this businesse? the *Old abused* refuge, of opposing *Iames* to *Paul*, is fixed on: This is the beaten plea of Papists, Socinians, and Arminians. Saith he, §. 24.

What Answer then would you give to a man, who wresting the words of

Paul *in certain places of his Epistles to the* Romans *and* Galatians *should beare you in hand, that all good Works whatever, are excluded from justification and Salvation, and that it is enough only to Believe.* Jam. 2. 20,21,22.23,24,25, 26.

Ans. He that shall exclude Good Works from Salvation, so as not to be the *way* and *meanes* appointed of God, wherein we ought to walk, who *seek* and *expect* salvation from God; and affirmes that it is enough to *Believe*, though a man bring forth no *Fruits* of Faith, or good Works; if he pretend to be of that perswasion, on the account of any thing delivered by *Paul*, in the Epistles to the *Romans* or *Galatians*, doth wrest the words and Sence of *Paul*, and is well confuted by that passage mentioned out of *James*.

But he that excluding all works from *Justification* in the sence declared, affirming that it is by *Faith only*, without works; and affirmes, that the Truth and Sincerity of that Faith, with its Efficacy in its own kind for our justification, is evinced by Works, & the mans Acceptation with God thereon justified by them, doth not *wrest* the words nor Sence of *Paul*, and speaks to the intendment of *James*.

2. *Paul* instructs us at large, how *Sinners* come to be *Justified* before God, and this is his professed designe in his Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*. *James* professedly exhorting Believers *to good Works*, demands of them, how they will *acquit themselves* before God and Man to be *justified*; and affirmes that this cannot be done, but by *works*. *Paul* tells us what Justification is; *James* describes *Justifying Faith* by its Effects; but of this also elsewhere. To all this he subjoynes.

§. 25. *I would know of you, who is a just or Righteous man? Is it not such an one, as apprehendeth, and applieth Christs Righteousnesse to himselfe, or at most desires to do Righteously, is not he accepted of God?.*

Ans. 1 Joh. 3.7,8,9,10. 1 Joh. 2. 29. Acts 10.34,35. Ezek. 18. 5,6,7, 8,9.

He to whom *God imputes Righteousnesse*, is righteous. This he doth to him, *who works not, but believes on him who justifies the ungodly*, *Rom.* 4. 5,6,7. there is then a Righteousnesse without *the works of the Law*, *Phil.* 3. 10. To *apprehend* and *apply* Christs Righteousnesse to our selves, are expressions of *Believing* unto justification, which the Scripture will *warrant*, *Joh.* 1.12. 2 *Cor.* 1.

30.

30. He that *Believeth*, so as to have Christ made Righteousnesse to him, to have *Righteousnesse* imparted to him, to be *freely* justified by the *Redemption* that is in the blood of Jesus, he is *just*: and this State and Condition, as was said, is obtained by *applying* the Righteousnesse of Christ to our selves; that is, by *reckoning him*, and *his Righteousnesse* by Faith, as tendered unto us in the offer and Promises of the Gospell.

Of *desiring to do righteously*, and what is intended by that expression, I have spoken before. But, §. 26.

2, There is a twofold *Righteousnesse*, a Righteousnesse *imputed*, whereby we are justified, and a Righteousnesse *inherent*, whereby we are sanctified. These M. *B.* would oppose, and from the *Assertion* of the one, argue to the *destruction* of the other; though they Sweetly, and Eminently comply in our *Communion* with God. The other Righteousnesse was before evinced: Even our *Sanctification* also is called *Righteousnesse*, and we are said to be *just* in that respect.

1. Because our *Faith* and interest in Christ is *justified* thereby to be true, and such as will abide the *fiery tryall*.

2. Because all the acts of it are fruits of *Righteousnesse*, *Rom.* 6. 19, 22.

3. Because it stands in opposition to all *Unrighteousnesse*, and he that doth not bring forth the *Fruit* of it, is Unrighteous.

4. With men, and before them it is *all our Righteousnesse*; and of this do the places mentioned by M. *Biddle* treat, without the least contradiction, or *colour* of it, to the *imputed Righteousnesse* of Christ, wherewith we are Righteous before God.

The in endment of the last *Querie* in this Chapter, is to prove §. 27. the *Apostasy of Saints*; or that *true Believers* may fall away *totally* and finally from grace. I suppose it will not be expected of *me*, that I should enter here into a *particular Consideration* of the places by him produced, having lately at *large* gone through the consideration of the whole *Doctrine* opposed; wherein not only the Texts here quoted by M. *B.* but many others, set off by the Management of an *able head*, and *dexterous hand*, are at large considered, thither therefore I referre the Reader. Doctrine of the Saints Perseverance Vindicated.

It might perhaps have been expected, that having insisted §. 28. so *largely* as I have *done*, upon some other heads of the Doctrine of the Gospell corrupted by M. *B.* and his Companions, that I should

should not thus briefly have passed over this *important Article* of Faith, concerning *Justification*: but besides my weariness of the work before me, I have for a *defensative* farther to plead, that this Doctrine is of *late* become the Subject of very many *Polemicall discourses*; to what Advantage of *Truth*, time will shew, and I am not willing to adde *oyle* to that fire. 2. That if the *Lord will*, and I *Live*, I intend to doe something *purposely*, for the *vindication*, and clearing of the whole Doctrine its selfe; and therefore am not willing *Occasionally* to *anticipate* here, what must in another *Order* and *Method* be insisted on; to which for a close, I adde a desire, that if any be willing to contend with Me about *this matter*, he would forbeare Exceptions against these *Extemporary Animadversions*, untill the *whole* of my Thoughts lye before him, unless he be of the *Persons* principally concern'd in this whole discourse, of whom I have no reason to desire that Respect or Candor.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Of *Prayer.*

And whether Christ prescribed a forme of prayer to be used by Believers: and of praying unto him, and in his name under the Old Testament?

§. 1. THE first Question is,

Is Prayer a Christian duty?

Anſ. *Pray without ceasing*, 1 Thess 5.17.

If by a Christian duty, a duty whereunto all Christians are obliged is understood, we grant it a *Christian duty*. The *commands* for it, encouragements to it, Promises concerning it, are innumerable; and the use and benefit of it, in our Communion with God, considering the state and condition of *sinne*, *Emptinesse*, *Want*, *Temptation*, Tryalls that here we live in, inestimable. If by a Christian Duty it be intended that it is required only of them who are Christians, and is instituted by something

thing peculiar in *Christian Religion*, it is denyed. Prayer is a *naturall acknowledgement* of God, that every man is everlastingly, and indispensably obliged unto by vertue of the Law of his Creation, though the matter of it be varied according to the severall states and conditions whereunto we fall, or are brought. Every one that lives in dependency on God, and hath his suplys from him, is by vertue of that dependance obliged to this duty, as much as he is to *own God* to be his God. He proceeds.

How ought men to pray? Ans. *Lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting*, 1 Tim. 2.8. §. 2.

The enquiry being made of the *manner of acceptable prayer*, the answer given respecting only *one* or *two Particulars*, is narrow and scanty. The qualification of the person praying, the meanes of accesse to God, the cause of acceptation with him, the ground of our confidence in our supplications, the Efficacy of the Spirit of Grace as promised, are either *all* omitted, or only *tacitely* intimated. But this, and many of the following Questions, with the answers, being in their *connexion* capable of a good and faire interpretation, though all be not expressed that the *Scripture* gives, in Answer to such Questions, & the most materiall requisite of prayer in the Holy Gost be omitted, yet drawing to a *close* I shall not farther insist upon them; having yet that remaining, which requires a more full *Animadversion*.

Q. 11. *Did not Christ prescribe a forme of prayer to his disciples, so that there remaineth no doubt touching the lawfullnesse of using a forme?* §. 3.

A. Luk 11.1,2,3,4.

Ans. If Christ prescribed a *forme of prayer* to his disciples, to be used *as a forme* by the repetition of the same words; I confesse it will be out of Question, that it is Lawfull to use a forme: but that it is lawfull not to use a forme, or that a man may use any prayer but a forme, on that supposition, will not be so easily determined. The words of Christ are, *when you pray, say, Our Father &c.* If in this prescription, not the *matter* only, but the *words* also are attended, and that forme of them which followes is prescribed to be used, by vertue of this command of Christ, it will be hard to discover on what ground we may *any otherwise*

pray, seing our Saviours command is positive, *when you pray, say, Our Father, &c.*

§. 4. That which M. B. is to prove is, that *Our Saviour hath prescribed the repetition of the same words ensuing*, and when he hath done so, if so he can do, his conclusion must be, that *that forme ought to be used*, not at all that *any else* may. If our Saviour have prescribed us *a forme*, how shall any man dare to *prescribe another*? or can any man do it without casting on his *forme* the reproach of *imperfection* and insufficiency? Our Saviour hath prescribed us a *forme of prayer* to be used as a forme by the repetition of the same words; therefore we may use it, yea we must, is an invincible argument, on supposition of the truth of the popposition. But our Saviour hath prescribed us such a *forme &c.* thererefore we may use another, which he hath not prescribed, hath neither *shew* nor *colour* of Reason in it.

§. 5. But how will M. B. prove that Christ doth not here instruct his Diciples in *what* they ought to pray for, and for *what* they ought in prayer to addresse themselves to God, and *under what* considerations they are to looke on God in their aproaches to him and the like, only, but also that he prescribes *the words* there mentioned by him to be repeated by them in their suplications. *Luk.* 11. he bids them say *Our Father &c.* which at large *Mat.* 6. is, *pray after this manner*: *Thus to this purpose.* I do not think the Prophet prescribes a *forme of words*, to be used by the Church when he sayes, *Take with you words, and turne to the Lord, and say unto him, Take away iniquity*, (Hos. 14. 2.) but rather calls them to *fervent supplication* for the pardon of sinne, as God should enable them to deale with him. And though the Apostles never prayd for any thing, but what they were for the substance directed to by this prayer of our Saviour, yet we do not find, that ever they *repeated* the very words here mentioned, or once commanded or prescribed the use of them, to any of the *Saints* in their days, whom they exhorted to pray so fervently and earnestly. Nor in any of the *Rules* and Directions, that are given for our praying, either in reference to our selves, or him, by whom we have accesse to God, is the use of these words at any time in the least

§. 6. *recommended* to us, or recalled to mind, as a matter of duty.

Our Saviour sayes when ye pray, *say, Our Father*; on supposition of the sence contended for, and that a *forme* of words is

prescibed,

prescribed, I aske whether we may at any time pray, and *not say* so? seeing he sayes, *when you pray*, say: whether we *may say any thing else*, or use any other words? whether the saying of these *words* be a part of the worship of God? Or whether any *promise* of *Acceptation* be annexed to the saying so? whether the *spirit of grace* and *supplication* be not *promised* to all believers? And whether he be not given them to enable them to pray, both as to *matter* and *manner*? and if so, whether the Repetition of the words mentioned by them, *who have not the Spirit given them* for the ends before mentioned, be availeable? and whether *prayer by the Spirit* where these words are not repeated, as to the *letters* and *Syllables*, and order wherein they stand, be acceptable to God? whether the prescription of a *forme* of words, and the gift of a *spirit* of prayer be consistent? whether the forme be prescribed because Believers are not able to pray without it? Or because there is a peculiar Holinesse force and *energy* in the letters words and syllables, as they stand in that forme? And whether to say the first of those be not derogatory to the Glory of God, and *efficacy of the Spirit*, promised and given to Believers; and the second, to *assert* the using of a Charme in the worship of God? whether in that respect *Pater noster* be not as good as *Our Father*? whether innumerable *poore soules* are not deluded & hardned by *Satisfying* their consciences in, and with, the use of this forme never knowing what it is to pray in the *holy Ghost*? And whether the Asserting this forme of words to be used, have not confirmed many in their *Atheisticall* blaspheming of the *holy Spirit* of God, & his Grace in the prayers of his people? And whether the repetition of these words, after men have been long praying for the things contained in them, as the manner of some is, be not so *remote* from any *pretence* or colour of *warrant* in the Scripture, as that it is in plaine termes *ridiculous*? When M. *Biddle*, or any on his behalfe, hath answered these questions, they may be supplyed with more of the like nature and importance.

Of our addresse with all our *Religious* worship to the Father, by Jesus Christ the *Mediatour*, how and in what manner we do so, and in what sence he is himselfe the *ultimate* object of divine worship, I have spoken before; and therefore I shall not need to insist on his next question, which makes some §. 7.

enquiry thereabout. That which followes is all that in this Chapter needs any Animadversion. The words are these,

§. 8. *Was it the custome during the time that Christ conversed on the earth (much lesse before he came into the world) to pray unto God in the name of Christ, or through Christ? or did it begin to be used after the Resurrection and exaltation of Christ? what saith Christ himselfe concerning this?*

Ans. Joh. 16. 24,25,26.

The times of the Saints in this world are here distinguished into different seasons: that before Christs *comming in the flesh*, the time of his *conversation* on earth, and the time following his Resurrection and Exaltation. What was the custome in these severall seasons of praying to God in the name of Christ, or *through him*, is enquired after; and as to the first and second it is denyed, *granted* as to the latter, which is further confirmed in the Answer to the last Question, from *Heb.* 13. 20, 21. Some briefe observations will disentangle M. B's *Catechumens*, if they shall be pleased to attend unto them.

§. 9. 1. It is not what was the *custome* of men to do, but what was the minde of God that they should do, that we enquire after. 2. That *Jesus Christ* in respect of his *Divine Nature*, wherein he is *One with his* Father, was alwayes *worshipped and invocated*, ever since God made any Creatures to worship him, hath been formerly declared. 3. That there is a twofold knowledge of Christ the Mediatour: One in generall, in *thesi*, of a Mediatour, the *Messiah* promised, which was the knowledge of the *Saints* under the *Old* Testament. 2. Particular, in *hypothesi*, that *Jesus of Nazareth* was that *Messiah*, which *also* was known, and *is* to the Saints under the *New* Testament. 4. That as to an explicite knowledge of the *way* and *manner* of Salvation, which was to be wrought, accomplished, and brought about by the Messias, the promised seed Jesus Christ, and the Addresse of men unto God by him, it was much more evidently and cleerly given after the Resurrection, and the Assention of Christ then before: the Spirit of Revelation being then poured out in a more abundant manner then before. 5. There is a twofold praying unto God in the name of Christ. One in expresse words, cleare and distinct intention of mind, insisting on his Mediation, and our acceptance with God on his account. The other implyed in

in all Acts of Faith, and dependance on God, wherein we rely on him, as the meanes of our acceſſe to God.

I ſay, theſe things being premiſed, 1. That before Chriſts coming into the world, the *Saints* of the *Old* Teſtament did pray, and were appointed of God to *pray* in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, in as much as in all their Addreſſes unto God they leaned on him, (as promiſed to them) through whom they were to receive the *Bleſſing*, and to be bleſſed; believing that they ſhould be accepted on his account. This was *vertually* prayer to God in the name of *Chriſt*, or through him. This is evident from the tenour of the Covenant wherein they walked with God; in which they were called to look to the ſeed of the woman, to expect the bleſſing in the ſeed of *Abraham*; ſpeaking of the ſeed as of one and not of many; as alſo by all their *types* and *Sacrifices* wherein they had by Gods inſtitution reſpect to him, with *Abraham*, by Faith even as we: So that whether we conſider the promiſe, on the account whereof they came to God, which was of Chriſt, and of bleſſing in him; or the means whereby they came, which were *Sacrifices*, & *types* of him; or the *confidence* wherein they came, which was of Attonement and forgiveneſſe of ſinne by him, it is evident, that all their *prayers* were made to *God* in the name of Chriſt, and not any upon any other account. And one of them is expreſſe in *termes* to this purpoſe *Dan.* 9.17. If they had any promiſe of him, if any Covenant in him, if any *Types* repreſenting him, if any light of him, if any longing after him, if any benefit by him or fruit of his Mediation, all their Worſhip of God was in him, and through him. §. 10.

2. For them who lived with *Him* in the dayes of his fleſh, their *Faith* and *Worſhip* was of the ſame *ſize* and *meaſure* with theirs that went before; ſo was their addreſſe to God in the *ſame manner*, and on the ſame account; only in this was their knowledge *enlarged*, that they believed, that, that *individuall Perſon* was he who was promiſed, and on *whom* their *Fathers* believed. And therefore they *prayed* to him for all Mercies Spirituall and Temporall, whereof they ſtood in need, as to be ſaved in a *Storme*, to have their *Faith encreaſed*, and the like, though they had not expreſſly, and cleerly made mention of his *Name* in their Supplications. And that is the ſence of our Saviour in the place of *John* inſiſted on, *Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my Name*; that is, *Expreſſly*, and in *direct* Application of the Promiſes §. 11.

made in the *Messiah* unto him, though they had their Accesse to God really and *vertually*, by and through him, in all the wayes before expressed. And indeed to Evidence the glory of the presence of the Spirit, when poured forth upon them with a *fulnesse* of Gifts and Graces, such things are *recorded* of their Ignorance, and Darknesse in the Mysteries of the Worship of God, that it is no great *wonder*, if they who were then also to be detained under the *Judaicall Pedagogie* for a season, had not received as yet, such an *improvement* of Faith, as to *aske*, and *Pray* in the name of Jesus Christ as exhibited, which was one of the great *Priviledges* reserved for the dayes of the Gospell. And this is all that M.B. gives Occasion unto in this Chapter.

CHAP. XXXV.

Of the Resurrection of the Dead, and the State of the Wicked at the Last Day.

§. 1. IN his last Chapter, M. *Biddle* strives to make his Friends *amends* for all the wrong he had done them in those foregoing. Having attempted to overthrow their Faith, and to turne them aside from the simplicity of the Gospell; he now informes them, that the *worst* that can happen to them, if they follow his Counsell, is but to be *annihilated*, or utterly deprived of their being, *Body and Soule*, in the day of Judgement. For that *everlasting Fire*, those *endlesse Torments*, wherewith they have been so *scared* and terrified formerly, by the *Catechismes* and *Preachings* of men that *left* and *forsook* the Scripture, it is all but a Fable, invented to affright Fooles and Children. On this account he lets his followers know, that if *rejecting the Eternall Son of God*, and his righteousnesse, they may not go to Heaven, yet as to Hell, or an *Everlasting* abode in Torments, they may be *secure*; there is no such matter provided for *them*, nor *any* else. This is the main designe in this Chapter, whose Title is, *Of the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Last Judgement, and what shall be the finall Condition of the Righteous and Wicked thereupon.*

§. 2. The first Questions lead only to Answers, that there shall be a *Resurection of the dead in generall*; that they shall be raised and judged by Christ, who hath received Authority from God to that purpose, that being the last great worke that he shall accomplish

accomplish by vertue of his Mediatory Kingdome committed to him. Some snares seeme to be laid in the way in his questions, being captiously proposed; but they have been formerly broken in pieces in the Chapters of the Deity of Christ, and his person; whither I remit the reader if he find himselfe entangled with them.

§. 3.

I shall only say by the way, that if M. *B.* may be expounded by his * *Masters*, He will scarce be found to give so cleare an Assent to the Resurrection of the dead, as is here pretended; that is to a *raysing againe* of the same *individuall body*, for the *substance*, and all substantiall parts. This his Masters think not possible; and therefore reject it, though it be never so expresely affirmed in the Scripture. But M. *Biddle* is silent of this discovery made by his Masters, and so shall I be also.

* *Deinde negant Resurrectionem carnis: hoc est, hujus ipsius corporis, quod carne ac sanguine praditū est, etsi fateantur corpora inducndi sunt esse resurrectura, h.e. ipsos homines fideles; qui tunc novis corporibus cœlestibus compendiolum* Doctrin. Eccles. in Polon.

That wherewith I am to deale he entersupon in this question. *Shall not the wicked and Unbelievers live for ever, though in torments, as well as the Godly and faithfull? or is eternall life peculiar to the Faithfull?* Ans. Joh. 3. 36.

§. 4.

The Assertion herein couched is, that the * *wicked* shall not live for ever in torments: and the *proof* of it is, because *eternall life* is promised only to the faithfull: yea, he that hath not the *Son shall never see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him*, Joh. 3. 36. As to the Assertion it selfe we shall attend further unto it instantly.

Itaque negant cruciatus impiorum & Diabolorum curaturos esse in æternum, verum omnes simul penitus esse abolendos: adeo ut mors & infernus ipse dicantur conjiciendi in stagnum illud ardens, Ap. 10. *Rationem addunt, quod absurdum sit, eum irasci in æternum; & peccata creaturarum finita, panis infinitis mulctare: præsertim cum hinc nulla in sius gloria illustretur:* Compen. Doct. Eccles. in Polon.

When * *Socinus* first broached this *Abomination*, he did it with

* *Nam quod ais, ea ibi, tum de Christianorum Resurrectione, tum de morte impiorum passim contineri, quæ a multis sine magna offensione, tum nostris tum aliis, legi non possint: scio equidem ea ibi contineri, sed nec judicio nec passim, nec ita aperte (cavi enim istud quantum potui) ut quispiam vir pius facile offendi possit, adeo ut quod nominatim attinet ad impiorum mortem, in quo dogmate majus est multo offensionis periculum, ea potius ex iis colligi possit, quæ ibi disputantur, quam expresse literis consignata extet: adeo ut lector, qui alioqui sententiam meam adversus Puccium de mortalitate primi hominis, quæ toto libro agitatur, quæq; ob non paucos quos habet fautores parum aut nihil offensionis parere potest, probandam censeat, prius sentiat doctrinam istam sibi jam persuasam esse, quam sua advertat animadvertat.* Faust. Socin. Epist. ad Johan. Volkel. 6. p. 431.

the

the greatest *cunning* and slight that possibly he could use; labouring to *insinuate* it insensibly into the minds of men; knowing full well how full of *scandall* the very naming of it would prove: but the mans successe was in most things beyond his own imagination.

§. 5. For the proof insinuated; Life, & *Eternall Life* in the Gospell, as they are mentioned as the *end*, & *Reward* of our *Obedience*, are not taken meerly *Physically*, nor do expresse only the *abode*, *duration*, & continuance of our *being*, but our *continuance* in a state & *condition* of *blessednesse* and *Glory*. This is so evident, that there is no one place, where *Life to come*, or *eternall life* are spoken of simply in the whole *new* Testament, but as they are a *Reward*, and a *blessed Condition* to be obtained by Jesus Christ. In this sence we confesse the wicked and impenitent shall never see Life, nor obtaine *Eternall Life*, that is, they shall never *come to a fruition of God to Eternity*; but that therefore they shall not have a Life or Being, though in torments, is a wild inference. I desire to know of M. B. whether the *evill Angels* shall be consumed or no, and have an utter end? If he say they shall, he gives us one new notion more: If not, I aske him whether they shall have *Eternall Life* or no? If he sayes they shall not enjoy eternall Life in the sence mentioned in the Scripture; I shall desire him to consider, that men also may have their *being preserved* and yet not be *partakers of Eternall life* in that sence wherein it it promised.

§. 6. The *proof* insisted on by M. *Biddle* sayes, that the *wrath of God abides upon unbelievers*, even then when they doe not *see life*; now if they *abide not*, how can the wrath of God abide on them? doth God execute his wrath upon that which is not? If they abide under wrath, they do abide. Under wrath doth not diminish from their abiding, but describes its condition.

§. 7. Death and Life in Scripture, ever since the giving of the first Law, and the mention made of them therein, as they expresse the condition of man in way of *Reward* or punishment, are not opposed *naturally*, but *morally*; not in respect of their being (if I may so say) and Relation, as one is the *privation* of the other in the way of nature, but in respect of the *state and condition* which is exprest by the one & the other, *viz.* of *Blessednesse*, or misery. So that

that as there is an *eternall Life*, which is as it were a *second life*, a *Life of glory* following a life of Grace: so there is an *eternall death*, which is the *second death*, a death of misery following a death of sinne.

The death that is threatned and which is opposed to *life*, and *Eternall Life*, doth not any where denote annihilation, but only a *deprivation* and comming short of that blessednesse which is promised with Life, attended with all the evills which come under that name, and are in the first commination; Those who are dead in trespasses and sinnes, are not nothing, though they have no life of grace But M. *Biddle* proceeds, and sayth, §. 8.

Though this passage which you have quoted seeme clearely to prove that eternall life agreeth to no other men but the Faithfull, yet since the contrary opinion is generally held among Christians, I would faine know of you whether you have any other places that affirme that the wicked dye directly, and that a second death; are destroyed and punished with everlasting destruction, are corrupted, burnt up, devoured, slaine, passe away, and perish? §. 9.

Anſ. Rom. 6. 23. Rom. 8. 13. Revel. 21. 6, 8. Revel. 2. 10, 11. 1 Theſſ. 5. 3. 2 Pet. 3. 7. 2 Theſſ. 1. 7, 8, 9. Gal. 6. 8 2 Pet. 2. 12. 1 Cor. 3. 17. Heb. 10. 39. Mat. 3. 12. Heb. 10. 26, 27. Luk. 19 27 1 Joh. 2. 17. 2 Cor. 2. 15, 16.

How well M.B. hath proved his intention by the place of Scripture before mentioned, hath been in part discovered, and will in our proceſſe yet farther appeare. The Ambiguity of the word *life* and *Eternall Life* (which yet is not ambiguous in the Scripture, being constantly used in one sence and signification, as to the purpose in hand) is all the pretence he hath for his Assertion besides that, his proofe that unbelievers doe not abide, lyes in this, that the wrath of God abides on them. §. 10.

2. This is common with this *Gentleman* and his *Masters*; *Christians generally think otherwise*, but we say thus; so slight do they make of the common Faith which was once delivered to the Saints. But he may be pleased to take notice, that not only Christians think so, but assuredly believe that it shall be so, having the expresse word of God to bottome that their faith upon. * And not only Christians believe it, but mankind generally in all ages consented to it; as might abundantly be evinced, §. 11.

τυχὰς ἢ, καὶ παῖς μὲν ὀμβρίοις ἀφεται ἢ, ταῖς καπνὶς ἀδάκνων Plutar. Pan-

§. 12. 3. But let the expressions wherewith M. B. endeavours to make good this his monstrous assertion of the Annihilation of the wicked and Unbelievers at the last day, be particularly considered, that the strength of his conclusion, or rather the *weaknesse* of it, may be discovered.

The first is that they are said to dye, and that the *second* death *Rom.* 6.23. *Rom.* 8.13. *Revel* 21, 18. *Revel.* 2. 10, 11. but how now will M B prove, that by *dying* is meant the Annihilation of body and Soule? There is mention, of a *naturall death* in Scripture, which though it be a *dissolution* of nature, as to its essentiall parts of body and soule, yet it is an *Annihilation* of neither; For the soule abides, and M. *B.* professes to believe, that the body shall *rise* againe. There is a Spirituall death in sinne also mentioned, which is nota destruction of the dead *Persons* being, but a morall condition wherein he is. And why must the last death be the *Annihilation* pretended? As to a comming short of that which is the proper *life* of the soule in the enjoyment of God, which is called *life* absolutely, and *eternall life*, it is a *death*; And as to any comfortable *attendencies* of a *being* continued, it is a death. That it is a *totall deprivation of being*, seeing those under it are to Eternity to abide *under torments*, (as shall be shewed) there is no colour.

§. 13. 2. It is called *destruction*, and *perdition*, and *everlasting destruction*, 1 Thes. 5.3. 2 Pet. 3. 7. 2 Thes. 1. 7, 8, 9. True, it is a *destruction* as to the utter casting men off from all and every thing wherein they had any hope or dependance; a casting them *eternally* off from the happines of *Rationall Creatures*, & the end which they ought to have aymed at. That is, they shall be destroyed in a morall not a naturall sence; to be cast for ever under the *wrath* of God, I think, is *destruction*: and therefore it is called *everlasting destruction*, because of the punishment which in that destruction abideth on them. To this are reduced the following expressions of utterly perishing, and the like, *Gal.* 6 8. 2 *Pet.* 2. 12. 1 *Cor.* 3. 17. 2 Pet. 3. 16.

§. 14. 3. *Burning up the chaffe with unquenchable fire*, is mentioned *Mat.* 3 12. but if this burning of the *chaffe* do consume it, pray what need it be done with *fire that cannot be quenched?* When it hath done its worke, it will surely be *put out*. The expression is *metaphorical*, and the allusion is not in the consumption of *chaffe*

in

in the fire, but in the casting it into the fire; or the setting fire unto it. So the fiery indignation is said to *devoure the adversaries*, not that they shall *no more be*, *but that they shall never see happinesse any more*; All these expressions being *metaphorical*, & used to set out the greatnesse of the wrath and indignation of God against impenitent sinners, under which they shall lye for ever. The residue of the expressions collected are of the same importance. Christs punishment of Unbelievers at the last day, is compared to a King saying, *bring hither mine Enemies, and slay them before me*, Luk. 19. 27. because as a naturall death is the utmost punishment, that men are able to inflict, which cuts men off from *hopes* and *enjoyments*, as to their natural condition, so Christ will lay on them the utmost of his *Wrath*, cutting them off from all hopes and enjoyments as to their *spirituall and morall* condition. It is said the *fashion of this world passeth away* 1 Joh 2. 17. because it can give no abiding continuing refreshment to any of the Sonnes of men; when he that doth the will of God hath an *everlasting continuance* in a good condition, notwithstanding the intervening of all troubles, which are in this life. But that *wicked* men have not their being continued to *eternity*, nothing is here expressed.

A *very few words* will put an issue to this controversy, if our blessed Saviour may be accepted for an Umpire; saith he, Mat. 25. 46. *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternall*: certainely he that shall be everlastingly punished, shall be *everlastingly*. His punishment shall not continue, when he is not. He that hath an end, cannot be everlastingly punished. Againe, saith our Saviour, in Hell the *fire shall never be quenched*; *Where the worme dyeth not, and the fire is not quenched* Mat. 9. 43, 44. which he repeats againe *v.* 46, and that M.B. may not cause any to hope the contrary, againe *v.* 48. This addes to the former miracle, that men should be *punished* and yet not be; that they shall be *punished by the stings of a worme* to torment them when they are not, and the burning of a fire, when their whole Essence is consumed. So also *Isa.* 66. 24. *their* torments shall be endlesse, and the meanes of their torments continued for ever: but for themselves (it seemes) they shall have an end, as to their being; and so NOTHING shall be punished with an *everlasting worme, and a fire never to be* §. 15.

quenched. Nay which is more, there shall be amongst them *weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth*, Mat. 8. 12. the utmost sorrow and indignation expressible, yea beyond expression; and yet they shall not be. God threatens men with death and destruction, and describes that death and destruction to consist in the abiding under his wrath in endlesse torments: which unexpressible sorrow evidently shewes that death is not a *consumption* of them as to the continuance of their being, but a deprivation of all the *good of life naturall, spirituall,* and *eternall*; with an infliction of the *greatest evills* that they can be *capacitated* to endure, and undergo, called their *destruction* and *perdition*. *

* A. *Ita jocaris, quasi ego dicam, eos esse miseros, qui nati non sunt, & non eos miseros, qui mortui sunt,* M. *esse ergo eos dicis.* A *immo, quia non sunt, cum fuerint, eos miseros esse* M. *pugnantia te loqui non vides? quid enim tam pugnat, quam non modo miserum, sed omnino quidquam esse, qui non sit.* A. *Quoniam me verbo premis, posthac non ita dicam, miseros esse, sed tantum, miseros, ob id ipsum quia non sunt.* M. *non dicis igitur, miser est* M *Crassus, sed miser Crassus.* A. *Ita plane.* M *quasi non necesse sit, quicquid isto modo pronunties, id aut esse, aut non esse, an tu dialecticis ne imbutus quidem es &c.* Cicer. Tuscul. Quest. Lib. 1.

§. 16. What hath been the intention and designe of M.B. in this his *Catechisme*, which I have thus farre considered, I shall not judge. There is one *Lawgiver* to whom both *he* and *I* must give an account of our labour, and endeavours in this businesse. That the tendency of the worke it selfe is to *encrease Infidelity* and *sin* in the world, I dare averre. Let this Chapter be an instance, and from the savour that it hath, let a tast be taken of the whole, and its nature be thereby estimated. That the greatest part of them to whom the mind of God, as revealed in Scripture, is in some measure made known, are not won and Prevailed upon by the *Grace, Love* and *Mercy* proclaymed therein, and tendred through Christ, so as to give up themselves in all holy Obedience unto God, I suppose will be granted. That these men are yet so over powred by the *terrour* of the Lord therein discovered, and the threats of the wrath to come, as not to *dare* to runne out to the utmost, that the desperate thoughts of their *own hearts*, & the Temptations of *Sathan* meeting in conjunction, would carry them out unto, as it hath dayly & manifold experiences to evince it, so the examples of men so awed by conviction, mentioned in the Scripture, do abundantly manifest. Now what is it among all the considerations of the *account* that

men

men are to make, and the *Judgement* which they are to undergo, which doth so *amaze* their soules, and fill them with horrour and Astonishment, so strike off their hands when they are ready to stretch them out to violence & uncleannesse, or so frequently maks their conception of sin *abortive*, as this of the *Eternity* of their punishment, which *impenitent* sinners must undergoe. Is not this that which makes *bitter* the otherwise *sweet* morsels that they role under their tongues? and is an Adamantine chaine to *coerce* and restraine them, when they breake all other cords, and cast all other bonds behind them? yea hath not this been from the creation of the world * the great *engine* of the providence of God for the preserving of mankind from the *outragiousnesse* and unmeasurableness of *iniquity* and *wickednesse*, which would utterly ruine all humane society, and work a degeneracy in mankind into a very neere *approximation* unto the beasts that perish; namely, by keeping alive in the *generallity* of *rationall creatures* a prevailing conviction of an abiding condition of evill doers in a state of misery. To undeceive the *wretched world*, and to set *sinfull man* at liberty from this bondage and thraldome to his own causeless feares, M. B. comes forth, and assures them all, that the Eternity of torments is a fable and *everlasting punishment* a lye; let them trouble themselves no more, the worst of their *misery* may be past in a moment; it is but *annihilation*, or rather *perdition of soule and body*, and they are for ever freed from the the wrath of the Almighty. Will they not say let us eate and drink for to morrow we shall dye? down we lye of a season: God it seemes will see us once againe and then *farewell* for ever. Whether ever there were a more *compendious* way of serving the designe of Sathan, or a more expedient engine to cast down and demolish the *banks* and bounds given to the bottomelesse lust and corruption of naturall men, that they may overflow the world with a deluge of sinne and confusion, considering the *depraved condition* of all men by nature, and the rebellion of the most against the love and mercy of the Gospell; I much doubt. But who is more fit to encourage wicked men to sin & disobedience, then he who labours also to pervert the righteous and obedient from their Faith?

* *Hæc Cæsar disseruit, credo falsa existimans ea quæ de infernis memorantur diverso itinere malos a bonis loca tetra, inculta, fœda atque formidolosa habere.* Cato apud Sallust. Bell. Catilin.

TO close this whole Discourse I shall present M. *Biddles Catechumens* with a shorter *Catechisme* then either of his, collected out of their *Masters Questions*, with some few inferences, naturally flowing from them; and it is as followes.

1. *What is God?*

Ans. God is a *Spirit, that hath a Body, shape, eyes, eares, hands, feet like to us.*

2. Where is this God?

Ans. *In a certaine place in Heaven, upon a throne, where a man may see from his right hand to his left.*

3. Doth he ever move out of that place?

Ans. *I cannot tell what he doth ordinarily, but he hath formerly come down sometimes upon the earth.*

4. What doth he do there in that place?

Ans. *Among other things, he conjectures at what men will doe here below.*

5. Doth he then not know what we do?

Ans. *He doth what we have done, but not what we will do.*

6. What frame is he in, upon his knowledge and Conjecture?

Ans. *Sometimes he is afraid, sometimes grieved, sometimes joyfull, and sometimes troubled.*

7. What peace and comfort can I have in committing my selfe to his Providence, if he knowes not what will befall me to morrow?

Ans. *What is that to me, see you to that.*

8. Is Jesus Christ God?

Ans. *He is dignifyed with the title of God, but he is not God?*

9. Why then was he called the only begotten Sonne of God?

Ans. *Because he was borne of the Virgin Mary.*

10. Was He Christ the Lord then when he was borne?

Ans. *No, he became the Lord afterwards.*

11. Hath he still in Heaven an humane body?

Ans. *No, but he is made a Spirit, So that being not God but man, he was made a God, and being made a God, he is a spirit, and not a man.*

12.

12. What is the Holy Ghost?

Anſ. *A principall Angell.*

13. Did death enter by ſin, or was mortallity actually cauſed by ſinne?

Anſ. *No.*

14. Why is Chriſt called a Saviour?

Anſ. *Becauſe at the Reſurrection he ſhall change our vile bodyes.*

15. On what other account?

Anſ. *None that I know of.*

16. How then ſhall I be ſaved from ſinne and wrath?

Anſ. *Keep the Commandements, that thou maieſt have a right to eternall Life.*

17. Was Chriſt the Eternall Sonne of God in his boſome, revealing his minde from thence, or was he taken up into Heaven, and there taught the Truths of God, as Mahomet pretended?

Anſ. *He aſcended into Heaven, and talked with God, before he came and ſhewed himſelfe to the world.*

18. What did Chriſt doe as a Prophet?

Anſ. *He gave a new Law.*

19. Wherein?

Anſ. *He corrected the Law of Moſes.*

20 Who was it that ſaid of old, *thou ſhalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy*?

Anſ. *God in the Law of Moſes, which Chriſt corrects.*

21. Is Chriſt to be worſhipped becauſe he is God?

Anſ. *No, but becauſe he redeemed us.*

22. May one that is a meer Creature be worſhipped with Divine or Religious worſhip?

Anſ. *Yes.*

23. How can Chriſt being a meer man, and now ſo farre removed from the earth, underſtand and heare all the prayers and deſires of the hearts of men, that are put up to him all the world over?

Anſ. *I cannot tell, for God himſelfe doth not know that there are ſuch actions, as our free actions are, but upon enquiry.*

24. Did Chriſt give himſelfe for an offering and Sacrifice to God in his Death?

Anſ.

Anſ. *No, for he was not then a Prieſt.*

25. Did Chriſt by his death make reconciliation for our ſinnes, the ſinnes of his people, beare their iniquities that they might have peace with God?

A. *No, but only dyed that they might turne themſelves to God.*

26. Did he ſo undergoe the curſe of the Law and was ſo made ſinne for us; were our inquities ſo laid on him, that he made ſatisfaction to God for our ſinnes?

A. *No, there is no ſuch thing in the Scripture.*

27. Did he merit or procure Eternall life for us by his Obedience and ſuffering?

A. *No, this is a fiction of the Generality of Chriſtians.*

28. Did he redeeme us properly with the price of his blood, that we ſhould be ſaved from wrath, death, and Hell?

A. *No, there is no ſuch uſe or fruit of his death and blood-ſhedding.*

29. If he neither ſuffered in our ſtead, nor underwent the Curſe of the Law for us, nor ſatisfyed Juſtice by making reconciliation for our ſinnes, nor redeemed us by the price of his blood, what did he do for us? on what account is he our Saviour?

A. *He taught us the way to Heaven, and dyed to leave us an example.*

30. How then did he ſave them, or was he their Saviour, who dyed before his teaching and dying?

A. *He did not ſave them, nor was their Saviour, nor did they aske any thing in his name, or received any thing on his account.*

31. Did Chriſt raiſe himſelfe according as he ſpake of the temple of his body, deſtroy this temple and the third day I will raiſe it againe?

A. *No, he raiſed not himſelfe at all.*

32. Hath God from eternity loved ſome even before they did any good, & elected them to life and Salvation to be obtained by Jeſus Chriſt?

A. *No, but he loved all alike.*

33. Did God in the ſending of Chriſt ayme at the Salvation of a certaine number of his Elect?

A. *No, but at the Salvation of men in generall whether ever any be Saved or no.*

34. Are all thoſe Saved for whom Chriſt dyed?

A. *The leaſt part of them are Saved.*

35.

35. Is faith wrought in us by the Spirit of God, or are we converted by the efficacy of his Grace?

A. *No, but of our selves we believe and are converted, and then we are made partakers of the Spirit and his grace.*

36. Are all true Believers preserved by the power of God unto Salvation?

A. *No, many of them fall away and perish.*

37. Is the Righteousnesse of Christ imputed to us for our Justification?

A. *No, but our own Faith and workes.*

38. Are we to receive or apprehend Christ and his Righteousnesse by Faith, that we may be justifyed through him?

A. *No, but believe on him that raised him from the dead, and without that, it suffices.*

39. Are we able to keep all Gods Commandements?

A. *Yes.*

40. Perhaps in our sincere endeavours? but can we do it absolutely and perfectly?

A. *Yes, we can keep them perfectly.*

41. What need a man then to apprehend Christs righteousnesse and apply it to himselfe by Faith?

A. *None at all, for there is no such thing required.*

42. What shall become of wicked men after the Resurrection?

A. *They shall be so consumed body and soul, as not at all to remaine in torments.*

Places of Scripture Opened and Explained in the Preceding Treatise.

GENESIS.

Cap.	Verſ.	Pag.
1.	1.	112
	26.	139
2.	16,17.	114,115
3.	4.	133
	16,17.	116,117
	22,23.	83
5	1.	63
6	5.	144
6	6.	78
7	9	78 &c.
8.	21.	144
9.	6.	138
15	13,14.	103
18	18,19.	102
	21	89
	25.	484
22	1,2,30,11.	85.

EXODUS.

13.	17.	83
34.	7.	516

LEVITICUS.

16	2,5. &c.	469
	21	474
25	25	583

NUMBERS.

12	7,8.	64
14	27,30.	83

DEUTERONOMY.

8.	2	86,87
13	3	86,87
17	12,13	488
18	18	371,429
31	16,17,18.	103
32	26,27	83

JOSHUAH.

2	11	52,56

JUDGES.

16	17, 11.	295

RUTH

Cap.	Verſ.	Pag.
3	19	583

1 SAMVEL

2	3	97
	30	83
15	10, 11.	83
	29	78,85

1 KINGS

8	7	52,56
13	2	103
22	28	103

NEHEMIAH.

1	11	655

JOB.

4	16	64
9	22	485
19	25	582
26	13	354
42	7,8,9	611,612

PSALMES.

2	7	236,237, &c.
18	20, 21, &c.	659
22	1	565,&c.
33	6	354
40	6,7,	471,472,476,&c 579,&c
51	7	145,146
58	3	146
135	3	46
139.	7,8,9,10.	52,56,101
147	5	69

PROVERBS

8	23	239,240,&c.
	21	573
	30,31	515
30	4	177

CANTICLES.

2	8,9	514

ISAIAH.

Cap.	Verſ.	Pag.
8	13,14	345,&c.
9	6	327,328,&c. 572,573
40	3	247
	13,14	91
	18	67
41	21,22,27	104
45	22,23	347
49	5	575,579
	25	589
52	13	500,&c.
53		501,525,&c
	4	516
	6	504,505,&c.
	10	576,577
	11	513,&c.
59	20	585
66	15	568,569

JEREMIAH.

10	10,11	407,408
17	56	408.409
23	6	247,248
	23	52,57,&c.

EZEKIEL.

5	13	69

MICAH.

5	2	233,234 &c.

ZACHARIAH.

2	8	247,249 &c. 252, &c.
9	11	588
12	10	346

MATHEW.

3	17	166
5	21,22,&c.	385,386,&c
	25,26	590
8	16,17	517
11	30	651
16	16	166,167 &c

Cap.	Verf.	Pag.
		321,322
19	17,18,19	654

LUKE.

1.	30,31,32,33,34,35.	180 (181,&c.
2	34	345

JOHN

3.	1,2,3,&c.	205,206,&c. 210,211,&c.
	14.	216,217,218, (219,&c.
3	13.	222,223 380,381
4	24	48,49
5	17,18	169,170
	19,20,30.	155,156
	23	399,&c.
	27	401
	37	66
6	62	221,222, (&c.382.
8	44	132.
	58	225,226,&c.
10	29.&c.	119,320,&c.
	30	171
	36	182,183, (& 222, &c.
12	41	286,287,&c.
14	9	337
	10	155,156
	28	187
15	26	359,360
16	13,14	358,361,362
	15	325,326
	28	222,223,&c.
17	5	242,243,&c.
	10	325, &c.
	18	222, 223, &c.
18	37	224
20	17	191
		189
20	28	262,263,&c 316, 317

ACTS.

5	22	154,155
3	20,22	370
4	24,27,28	457
10	38	154,&c
13	32,33	184,579
	38,39	475
15	18	91,101
16	13	358,&c
20	28	262, 263, &c.

ROMANS.

1	2,3	173,174. &c
	32	487
2	5	60
	6.7.8	655
3	5	69
	25	476
	23,24,25	593.602, (603, &c
4	5	649
5	10.	615 616,&c.
	12	119 129 147 (& 146,147
	18	457,558,&c.
8	28, 29, 30.	639
	33 34	594
9	5	117,318
	32, 33	345
	26	585
11	34,35	91
	32	591
14	9, 10, 11.	152,153

1 CORINTHIANS

2	8	342
8	6.	46,47.151,152 339.340
6	20	6.8
10	9 28	,286 &c
15	24, 28	188.189

2 CORINTHIANS.

5	17	212
	19	457,&c.
	21	510
	18,19,20,21.	617, 618,&c

GALATIANS.

4	8	408
6	2	384

EPHESIANS.

Cap.	Verf.	Pag.
1	4 5	639.659
2	12,13,14.15,16.	618, (619 &c
4	4	352
	5	150,151,&c.
	6.	46,47 69
5	2	451
	6	69
	17	660
8	9,10	662

PHILIPIANS.

2	6,7	289,290,&c

COLOSSIANS.

1	15	323.324
	16	267,267,&c
	18	185
2	9	338

1 THESSALONIANS

2	4	87
5	17	666

2 THESSALONIANS

1	5	655

1 TIMOTHY

1	5	660
3	16	302,&c.

TITUS.

2	11	655
	13	257.258
	14	596

HEBREWS.

1	2	273
	3.	452,283,284,&c. 337
	4.5	185
	8 9	191
	10,11,12	276,277,&c
2	10	436
	16	309,310,&c 575
	14 15	567,&c.
	17. 18	436,437
3	4	251

Cap.	Verſ.	Pag.
4	12	91
	13	100
5	1	428,429,&c.
	5	186
	6,7	452
	9,10	450
7	3	177
	15	449
	19	395
	25	450
	27	453
8	1,2,4	437, &c.
9	12	449,&c. 453
	15	597
	26	454
10	1,2,3,4.	467,468 &c.
	5	215, 313
		476,477,&c.
		574,575

Cap.	Verſ.	Pag.
	9,10	570,&c.
	JAMES.	
2	20,21,&c.	664
3	9	65
	1 PETER.	
1	10,11	244,245
	12	356,357
	18,19	596,608
2	24	537
3	18	457,&c
	19,20	244,245
	2 PETER.	
3	9	645
	1 Ep. JOHN.	
	10	659
3	20	91,101
4	3	312,313

Cap.	Verſ.	Pag.
5	3	651,&c.
	20	167, 254
		255, &c
	JUDE.	
	4	256
	REVELATION.	
1	5	185
	8	259, 260,261
4	8	261,&c.
17	14	344
19	13	335, 356
	16	345
	20	409
22	9	404
	14	655

ERRATA.

Some of the miſtakes in Printing may be thus rectifyed.

PAg. 45. *lin.* 5. taske, *l.* 3. Chriſtianity, I ſhall not, *p:* 46. *l:* 6. doth not profeſſe, *p:* 49. *l.* 22. queſtion, *p.* 52. *l.* 11. *r.* and. *l:* 16. *r.* us. *p.* 54. *l. ult. quantitative p.* 55. *l.* 27. indiſtant. *p.* 57. *l.* 2 diſtant. *l.* 16. diſtant. *p.* 60. *l. ult.* one. *p.* 63. *l.* 7. neither. *p.* 65. *l.* 27. *r.* הפנין *p.* 69. *l.* 30. though. *p.* 74. *l.* 2. phraſe. *p.* 114. *l.* 16. unto. *p.* 134. *l.* 3. way of Salvation, *p.* 139. *l.* 5. mortality. *p.* 141. *l.* 6. *r.* a *p.* 142. *l. ult.* depended, *p:* 151. *l:* 34. *r:* but, *p.* 155. *l.* 5. *r:* diſappeare, *p.* 157. *l:* 9 *dele* that, *l: ult: r. Luke*, *p.* 167. *l:* 2. Apoſtles, *p:* 174. *l.* 21. νεκρῶν *p:* 181. *from l.* 16. *to which*, *l:* 25. *in a parentheſis. p:* 182. *l.* 5. invincible. *p:* 196. *l:* 18. diſcerne, *p:* 215. *l:* 13. Heb: 10. *p:* 243 *l: ult. loquendi. p:* 276. *l:* 33. repeat, *p:* 666. *l.* 2. imputed, *l:* 5, 6. receiving.

In the Appendix.

Pag. 32. *l:* 8. his, *p:* 33. *l:* 5. *contractibus*, *p:* 39. *l:* 13. ſhould, *p:* 40. *l:* 1. if, *l:* 11 *collitur.*

Of

Of the Death of Christ, and of Iustification.

The doctrine concerning them *formerly* delivered *Vindicated from the* Animadversions *of Master* R. B.

OF this *taske* I would *complaine* if I *durst*: but I know not how it may be *taken*; and whither it may not *occasion* another *Apology*. So are *writings* of this nature, as *waves* that thrust on *one* another. *Bookes* (saies *one*) *are like good turnes*; They must be new *covered*, or it will raine *through*. I was in *some hope* to have *escaped* this *trouble*. But πόνος πόνῳ πόνον φέρει. And *Chrysostome* tels us, that πολλῆς γέμει ταραχῆς ἡ ζωὴ, καὶ θορύβων μεστὸς ὁ παρῶν βιός ἐστιν. I desire to be content with my *portion*, being better yet then that of *Livius Drusius*, who complained *uni sibi nec puero quidem unquam ferias contigisse*; so it *be in* and *about* things of *reall* use, and Advantage to the *soules* of men I can be content with *any* paines that I have *strength* to Answer. But this is an *evil*, which every one who is not *starke blind* may see in *polemicall* writings: almost their constant end, is λογομαχία, περιαυτολογία, ἀπολογία, whence saith the *Apostle* γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημίαι, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραὶ, παραδιατριβαὶ. Having through the *providence* of God (whether on my part *necessarily* or *wisely* I know not, (θεὸς οἶδα) engaged in *publike*, for the defence of *some* truths of the *Gospel* (as I beleive) I was never so *foolish*, as to expect an escape without *Opposition*. He that puts forth a *booke*, *sentences* his Reason to the *Gantelope*; every one will strive to have *a lash* at it in its *course*, and he must be *content* to beare it. It may be said of *bookes* of this kind, as he said of *children*, (things often compared) τὸ γίνεσθαι πατέρα παίδων, λύπη, φόβος, φροντίς. *Anxeity*, *feare*, and *trouble*, attend their Authors. For my owne part, as I *provoked* no man *causlesly* in *any* of my writings, defended no other doctrine

Sophocles in Aiac:
Chrysost: Con: 1. περὶ προνοίας.
Sueton. in vit. Tib.
Menand:

 professedly

professedly but the *common faith* of the *Protestant Churches*, of which I found the *Saints* of God in *possession*, when I came first *acquainted* with them; so I have from the *beginning* resolved, not to *persist* in any *Controversy*, as to the *publike* debate of it, when once it begins to *degenerate* into a *strife of words*, and *personall reflections*: so much the more *grievous* is it to me, to engage in *this now* in hand, of the *necessity* whereof *I* shall give the Reader a *breife* Account. That as to the *matter* of the *contest* between *M. B.* and *my selfe*, *M. B.* is my *witness* that I gave not the *occasion* of it, so as to the *manner* of its handling, that I carryed not on the *Provocation*, I appeale to all that have read my *Treatise*, which is now animadverted on. The same *person*, *& initium dedit*, *& modum abstulit*. Some *freedome* of *Expression*, that perhaps *I* might righteously have made *use* of, to prevent future *exacerbations I* designedly forbore. *I* know that some men must have Βύσσινα ῥήματα. Expressions concerning them, had need be μυροβρεχεῖς; or like the *letters*, that men *print* one of another, which are oftentimes answerable to that of *Augustus* to *Mecœnas*; *vale mel gemmeum, medulliæ ebur ex Hetruria, laserarietinum, adamas supernas, Tiberinum margaritum, cilniorum smaragde, jaspis figulorum, berille Porsennæ, carbunculum Italiæ*, καὶ ἵνα συντέμω πάντα, &c. I *hoped* therefore this business had been at an *issue*; Others also were of the same *mind*; especially considering that he had almost *professed* against *proceeding* farther in this *controversy* in some other *Treatises* and *Apologies*. For my *owne part I* must *profess* my thoughts arose *only* from his long *silence*. The Reason of *this I* knew could not be that of him in the *Poet*, φιλεῖ γὰρ ὀκνεῖν πρᾶγμ' ἀνὴρ πράσσων μέγα: seeing he could have *done it as speedily as have written so much paper*. The expressions in his *bookes* seemed to me, as the *fermentation* of a *spirit*, that at one time or other would *boyle* over. I confess *I* was something delivered from the *feare* of it, when not long before the publishing of his *Confession* and *Apology*, *I met with* him, and had occasion of much *conference* with him at *London*, even about *Justification*; and he made not the least mention of this *confutation* of me, which he hath now published; but φιλλικοῖς ἔνειδεν ὄμματιν. but though this present *contest* might have been *easily* prevented, (as the Reader will instantly perceive) yet I presume the *booke* was then *wholy printed*, and *M. B.* was not to *loose* his *pains*, nor the *World* the *benefit* thereof, nor the *printer* his *inke* and *paper*, for so

τὴν κενοδοξίαν ὡς τελεσταῖον χιτῶνα ἡ ψυχὴ πέφυκεν ἀποτίθεσθαι.

Sophocles.

slight

ſleight a cauſe, as the preventing of the *aſperſion* of me for an *Antinomian*.

But *jacta eſt alea*, now it is *out*, we muſt make the *beſt* of it; and I hope the Reader will *excuſe* me in what followes, ὡς ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ἀλλὰ τιμωρούμενος.

But why muſt my *Arguments* be *anſwered*, and my *ſelfe* confuted? Two *Reaſons* hereof are given. The firſt by very many *Inſinuations*; *namely*, that I have delivered *dangerous doctrines*, ſuch as *ſubvert the foundation* of the Goſpell, plaine *Antinomianiſme*; and theſe two *poſitions* are laid down to be *confuted*, viz: *firſt*, *that the elect are juſtified from eternity*, *or from the death of Chriſt*, *before they believe*. Secondly, *that juſtification by faith*, *is but in foro conſcientiæ*, *or in our owne feeling*, *& terminated in conſcience*, *& not in foro dei*: *further then conſcience may be ſo called*: & my Arguments for them are anſwered, Chap: 8. pag: 189. But what *ſhould a man do* in this caſe? I have already *publiſhed* to *M. B.* and *all the World*, that I believe neither of *theſe propoſitions*; muſt I take *my oath* of it, or get *Compurgators*, or muſt we have *no end* of this quarrell? Let *M. B.* prove any ſuch *thing*, out of any *thing* I have *written*, and as *Nonius* ſaies, out of *Nævius*, *ei dum vivebo*, *fidelis ero*. I am ſure this minds me of that *paſſage* in the *Jewiſh Liturgy*, *placeat tibi domine liberare me à lite difficili*, *& ab adverſario difficili*, *ſive is ad fœdus tuum pertineat*, *ſive non pertineat*. The following *Examination* of the *particulars* excepted againſt by *M. B.* will make this evident, whence it will appear, that ὡς ἐξ πρόσωπος δῆτα τὰ πρόσωπα κακῶς: yea but, *Monand.*

Secondly, *two* or *three* Reverend *brethren told him*, *that to that part which he hath conſidered*, *it was neceſſary I ſhould be confuted*; Who theſe *reverend brethren are I* know not; I preſume they may *be of thoſe friends* of *M. B.* that *blame him for replying to M. Blake*, *but ſay for all the reſt with whom he hath dealt* (of whom I am forc't to be one) that it is *no matter*, *they deſerved no better*. Whoever they *are*, they might have had more *mercy* then not a *little* to *pitty* poore men under the ſtrokes of an *heavy hand*. Nor do I know what are the *Reaſons* of the *brethren*, why *my name* muſt be brought on this *ſtage*; nor perhaps is it *meet* they ſhould be *publiſhed*. It may be it is *neceſſary* that *M. Owen* be *confuted* among *Antinomians*, and that ἐν τρίτοις. But what if it ſhould *appeare* in the *iſſue*, that *M. Owen* hath deſerved better at *their hands*, and that this *adviſe* of *theirs* might have been *ſpared*? But not to complaine *M. B. Preface.* *Preface to the Reader.* οὐκοῦν καλὸν τὸν ἐχθρὸν, ἀλλὰ κακὸν τὸν φίλον; ἵνα τί κακὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς μὴ ἐπὶ τοῖς φιλτάτοις κακοῖς.

of I know not whom. To those *Reverend Advisers* I shall only say, ἴσως πᾶν ἔχει καλῶς, τῷ παιγνίῳ δότε κράτος, καὶ πάντες ὑμεῖς μετὰ χαρᾶς ποπτύσατε; but if it appeare in the *issue*, that I was charged with *that* which I never *delivered*, nor *Wrote*, and that my *Arguments* to one *purpose*, are answered in reference to another, and that this is the summe of *M. B's. discourse* against me, I shall only recommend to *them* some *verses* of old *Ennius*, as I find thē in Aul: Pop:

Nam qui lepide postulat alterum frustrari
Quem frustratur, frustra eum dicit frustra esse,
Nam qui sese frustrari quem frustra sentit.
Qui frustratur is frustra est, si non, ille est frustra.

What then shall *I do?* I am imposed on to lay the *foundation* of all *Antinomianisme*, (as *M. Burgesse* is also) to maintaine *Justification* from *Eternity*, or *at least* in the *Crosse of Christ*, of all that *should believe*; and *justification by faith* to be but the *sense of it* in our *consciences* (which *last* I know *better* and *wiser men* then my *selfe* that do, though I do not) & so *reckoned* amongst them that overthrow the *Whole Gospell*, and place the *Righteousnesse* of Christ in the *roome* of our owne *believing* and *repentance*, rendering them useless.

Shall I undertake to *confute M. B's.* booke, at least wherein we differ, & so *acquit* my selfe both from *Antinomianisme* & *Socinianisme* in the businesse in hand? but (1) The *things* of this *discourse* are *such*, and the *manner* of handling them of *that* sort, that *M. B.* *heartily* in the *close* of his booke, begs *pardon* for them, who have *necessitated* him to spend *so much time* to so *little purpose*; καὶ ταῦτα περίσσων φύσιν ἀνὴρ ἐδὲν ποιῶν. As I see not yet the *necessity* of his *paines*, so *I* desire his reverend *Advisers* may thanke him for this *Intercession*, for I suppose *my selfe* (*at least*) not concerned therein. But this *I* can say, that *I* am so farre from *engaging* into a long *operous conteſt*, in a matter of *such importance* and *consequence*, as the *subject* of that *booke* is represented to be, that *I* would rather *burne my pennes* and *bookes* also, then serve a *provocation* so farre, as to spend *halfe* that time therein, which the *confutation of it* would require from so *slow* and *dull* a *person* as my selfe.

Pag. 462.

2. He hath in his *preface* put such *terrible* Conditions upon *those* that will *Answer* him, that I know *no man* but must *needs* be *affrighted* with the thoughts of the *attempt*. He requires, that whoever *undertake* this worke, be of a *stronger judgment*, and a

more

more discerning head, then he; that he be a better proficient in these studies then he; that he be freer from prejudice then he; that he have more illumination and grace then he: that is! that he be a *better, wiser, more holy*, and *learned man*, then *M. B.* Now if we may take *M. B's. character*, by what he *discourseth* of his *mortification*, and *sincerity*, his *freedome* from *prejudice*, &c: as there is no *Reason* but that we should; I profess I know not where to find his *match*, much less any to *excell* him, with whom I might *intercede* for his *paines* in the consideration of this *Treatise*: for as for *my selfe*, I am *seriously* so farre from *entertaining* any such *thoughts* in reference to *M. B.* that I *dare not do it* in reference to any one *godly Minister* that I know in the world; yea I am *sure* that I am not in *respect* of all the *qualifications* mentioned, put together, to be preferred before any *one* of them. If it be said, that it is not *requisite* that a man should *know* this *of himselfe*, but *only* that he *be so indeed*; I must needs *professe*, that being *told* before hand that such he *must be*, if he *undertake* this worke, I am not able to *discerne* how he should *attempt* it, and not *proclaime* himselfe, to have an *opinion* of his owne *qualifications*, answerable to that which is *required* of him.

3. It is of some *consideration*, that *a man* that doth not know so much of *him* as *I do*, would by his *writings* take him to be *immitis* and *immisericors*, a very *Achilles*, that will not *pardon* a man in his *grave*; but will take him *up*, and cut him in a *thousand* peices. I *verily* beleive, that if a *man* (*who had nothing else to do*,) should gather into *one heape* all the expressions, which in his *late bookes*, *confessions*, and *Apologies*, have a *lovely* Aspect towards himselfe, as to *Ability*, *Diligence*, *sincerity*, on the *one* hand, with all *those* whichare full of *Reproach* and *contempt towards others*, on the *other*, the *view* of them could not but a *litle startle* a man of so great *modesty*, & of such eminency in the *mortification* of *pride* as *M. B.* is. But

οὐθεὶς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τὰ κακὰ συνορᾷ
σαφῶς ἑτέρου δ' αἰχμονοῦντος ὄψεται.

Had I not *heard* him professe how much he *vallued* the *peace* of the *Church*, and declare what his endeavours for it were; I could not but *suppose* upon *evidences* which I am unwilling to *repeat* together, that an *humour of disputing* and *quarelling* was very *predominant* in the man: however though a *profession* may *passe* against all evidences of fact to the contrary whatever; yet I dare say that he lives not at ἀπραγόπολις.

That he hath been able to discerne the *positions* he *opposes* in the begining of his eighth *chapter* to be contained in any *writings* of mine, as *maintained* by me, I must impute to such a *sharp-sightednesse*, as was that of *Caius Caligula*; to whom, when he enquired of *Vitellius* whether he saw him not *embracing* the *moone*, it was *replyd, solis* (*domine*) *vobis diis licet invicem videre*.

Dio.

What shall I then doe? shall I put forth a *Creed*, or an *Apologie* to make it *appeare*, that indeed I am not *concerned* in any of *Mr. Baxtor's Contests*; but.

1 I dare not *look* upon my selfe of any *such consideration* to the *World*, as to *write bookes* to give them an account of my *selfe*, (with whom they very little trouble their thoughts) to tell them my *faith* and *belief*, to acquaint *them* when I am *well*, and when I am *sick*, what *sinne* I have *mortified* most, what *books* I have *read*, how I have *studied*, how I *goe*, and *walk*, and look, what one of my *neighbours* sayes of me, and what *another*; how I am *praised* by some, and *dispraised* by others, *what I doe*, and what I would have others *doe*, what diligence, impartiality, uprightness I use, what I thinke of other men: so *dealing unmercifully* with perishing paper, and making books by relating to my selfe, worthy *deferri in vicum vendentem thus & odores*,

Et piper, & quicquid chartis amicitur ineptis; And I should plainely shew my selfe αλαζονοχαυνοφλύαρος.

2 I know there is no *need* of any *such* thing; for all that *know* me, or *care* to *know* me, know *ful well*, that *in* and about the *doctrine of justification by faith*, I have no *singular opinion* of my own, but embrace the *common* known *doctrine* of the *Reformed Churches*, which by God's good Assistance in *due* time, I shall further *explicate* and *vindicate* from *Papists*, *Socinians*, and *Arminians*; I cannot complaine, that ἐγὼ εἰμι μόνος τῶν ἡμῶν ἐμος. I have *companions* and *councellours*. And in truth it is very *marveilous* to some, that this *learned Person*, who hath manifested so great a *tendernesse* on *his own behalfe*, as to call their *books monsters*, and themselves *lyars*, who charged his *opinion* about *justification* with a *Coincidence* with that of the *Papists*, should himselfe so *freely* impute *Antinomianisme* to others, an opinion which he *esteemes* as *bad*, if not every *way worse* then that of the *Papists* about *justification*; but *contenti simus hoc Catone*; which is all I shall say, though some would adde;

Apollidorus.

Homine

Homine imperito nunquam quidquam injustius
Qui nisi quod ipse facit nihil rectum putat.

3 I must *adde*, if for a *defensative* of my selfe, I should here *transcribe* and *subscribe* some *Creed* already *published*, I must professe, it must not be *that* of *M. B.* (*pag.* 12, 13,) which he calls *the Worcester-shire profession of faith*; and that as for *other* Reasons, so *especially* for the way of *delivering* the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, which but in *one expression at most* differs from the *knowne* confession of the Socinians: & in sundry *particulars*, gives to great a *countenance* to their abominations: For instance, the first *Article* of it, is, *I believe that there is one only God, the Father, infinite in being, &c:* which being carryed on toward the *end*, and joyned to the *profession* of *Consent*, as it is called, in these words, *I doe heartily take this one God, for my only God and chiefest good, and this Jesus Christ for my only Lord* Redeemer *and* Saviour, evidently *distinguishes* the Lord Jesus Christ our Redeemer, *as our Lord*, from that one *true God*; which not only directly *answers* that Question of *M. Biddles*, how *many Lords of Christians are there in distinction from this one God*, but in tearmes falls in with that which the *Socinians* professe to be the *tessera* of their *Sect*, and *Churches*, as they call them, which is, that they *believe* in the *one true living God the father*, and in his *only Sonne Jesus Christ our Lord*. Nor *am I* at so great an *indifferency* in the *businesse* of the *procession* of the *Holy Ghost*, as to those expressions of, *from*, and *by the Sonne*, as that *confession* is at; knowing that *there* is much more *depends* on these *expressions* as to the *doctrine* of the *Trinity*, then all the *Confessionists* can readily apprehend. But yet *here*, that we may not have occasion to say Λεπτολόγων ἀπολογιῶν ϱ̓ᾳ̃ον πλῆθος! *I* doe *freely* clear the *Subscribers* of that *Confession* from any *sinister* opinion of the *Trinity*, or the *Deity* of Jesus Christ, though as to *my selfe I* suppose my *Reasons* abundantly sufficient to detaine me frō a *subscription* of it But if this course be not to be insisted on, shall *I*

3 Runne over all the *Confessions* of Faith, and *Common places* which I *have*, or *may* have here at *Oxford*, and manifest my *Consent* with them in the *matter* under Question. I confess this were a *pretty* easy way to make up a *great booke*: but for *many* reasons it suits not with my *judgment*, although I could have the *Advantage* of giving what they *positively* deliver in Abundance as their maine *Thesis*, and foundation, without cutting off *discourses*

from

from their *Connexion* and coherence, to give them a *new face* and *Appearance*, which in their own *proper* place they had *not*, or to gather up their *Conceſſions* to the *Adverſaries* to one *purpoſe*, and applying them to *another*: And therefore I ſhall *wholy* wave that way of *procedure*, although I might by it, perhaps *keep up ſome good reputation with the Orthodox*.

To have *paſſed* over then this whole buſineſs in *ſilence* would have ſeemed to me *much* the beſt courſe, had I not ſeen a *man* of ſo great *integrity* and *impartiality*, as *Mr. B.* (who ſo much complaines of want of *Candour* and *Truth* in others) counting it ſo *neceſſary* to *vindicate* himſelfe from imputations, as to multiply *books* and *Apologies* to that end and purpoſe, and that under the *chaines* of very ſtrong *importunities*, and *entreaties* to turne the courſe of his *ſtudies* and paines to things more uſeful; wherein *his labours*, (as he ſaies) have met *with exceſſive eſtimation and prayſes*. And may doubtleſs well do ſo, there being (as he informes us) *too few divines that are diligently & impartially ſtudious of Truth: and fewer that have ſtrong judgments, that are able to diſcerne it, though they doe ſtudy it.* (*Pref.*) which though Mr. *B.* *arrogates not to himſelfe*, yet *others* may doe well to *aſcribe* to him. I hope then he will not be *offended*, if in *this* I follow his ſteps, though *haud paſſibus æquis*: and, *longo poſt intervallo*. Only in *this* I ſhall deſire to be *excuſed*, if, ſeeing the things of *my ſelfe* are very *inconſiderable*, and whatever I can write on that *Account* being like the diſcourſes of men returning *è lacu furnoq;*, that *I multiply* not leaves to no *purpoſe*. *I* ſhall then deſire

1. To enter my *Proteſt*, that *I* doe not engage with *Mr. B.* upon the *termes* and *conditions* by him preſcribed in his *Preface*; as though *I* were *wiſer*, or *better*, or *more learned* then he; being fully *aſſured*, that a man *more unlearned* then either of us, and *leſſe ſtudied*, may reprove and convince us of Errours; and that we may deale ſo with *them*, who are *much more* learned then us both.

2 To *premiſe*, that *I* doe not deliver my *thoughts* and whole *judgment* in the *buſineſſe* of the *Juſtification of a ſinner*: which to doe, *I* have deſigned another *opportunity*, εἰ θεὸς θέλει, καὶ ζήσω, and ſhall not now prevent my ſelfe.

Theſe things being premiſed, *I* ſhall

1. Set *downe* what *I have delivered* concerning the 3 heads, wherein it is *pretended* the difference lyes between us.

2. Paſs

2. Pass through the *Consideration* of the *Particular places*, where *M. B.* is *pleased* to take notice of *me* and my *judgment* and Arguments, as to the things of the *Contests*, wherein he is engaged: And this course I am necessitated unto; because as *M. B.* states the *Controversies* he pursues in the beginning of the *eighth Chapter*, I profess my selfe wholly *unconcerned* in them.

The things then that I am *traduced* for maintaining and giving *countenance* unto, are

1. The justification of the *Elect from Eternity*.

2. Their *Justification at the Death of Christ*, *as dying and suffering with him*.

3. *Their Absolution in heaven before their believing*.

4. *That Justification by Faith, is nothing but a sense of it in the Conscience*.

5. That *Christ suffered the* idem *which we should have done*; *and not only* tantundem. Of all which very briefly.

1. For the *first*, *I* neither *am*, nor ever *was* of that judgment; though, as it may be *explained*, *I* know *better*, *wiser*, and *more learned men* then my selfe, that *have* been, and *are*. This *I once before* told *M. B.* and desired him to beleive me, (*Of the Death of Christ* pag. 33.) *If* he will *not yet do it*, *I* cannot help it.

2. As to the *second*, *I* have also *entreated* *M. B.* to *believe* that it is *not* my judgment in that very *booke* on which he *animadverts*; and hoped *I* might have obtained *Credit* with him, he having no evidence to the Contrary: (let the Reader see what *I* deliver to this Purpose pag. 34. 35) *In* what sense *I* maintaine that the *Elect dyed and rose with Christ*, see pag. 82. 83. 84.

3. The *third*, or *Absolution in heaven before beleiving*. What *I* meane hereby *I* explaine pag. 77. and 79. (Let it be consulted.) *It* was, on *I know not what grounds*, before by *M. B.* imposed on me, that *I* maintained *Justification* upon the Death of Christ before *beleiving*: which *I* did with some *earnestness* reject, & proved by sundry Arguments, that we are not *changed* in our state and *Condition* before we do *beleive*. Certainly never was man more *violently* prest to a *warfare*, then *I* to this contest.

4. That *Justification by Faith is nothing but a sense of it in conscience*, *I* never *said*, *I* never *wrote*, I never *endeavoured* to prove. What may a man expect from others who is so dealt withall by a man whose *writings* so praise him, as *M. B's.* do.

5. For the *last thing*, what *I affirme* in it, what *I beleive* in it, what *I* have *proved*, the preceding *Treatise* will give an account to the Reader. And for my *judgment* in these things, this *little* at *present* may suffice. *M. B's.* Animadversions, in the Order wherein they lye, shall *nextly* be considered.

The *first* express mention that I am *honoured withall* is towards the *end* of his *Preface*, occasioned only by a *passage* in my briefe *Proeme* to *M. Eyres* his booke of *Justification*. My words as by him transcribed are: *For the present I shall only say, that there being too great evidence of a very welcome Entertainment and Acceptation, given by many to an almost pure Socinian Justification, and exposition of the Covenant of Grace &c.* To which M. B. subjoynes: *But to be almost an errour, is to be a truth. There is but a thred between Truth and errour, and that which is not neere to that errour, is not Truth, but is liker to be another errour, in the other extreme. For Truth is one strait line, Errour is manifold, even all that swerves from that line in what space or degree soever.*

Arist: Rhet: lib. 2. cap. 26. *Malum omen*! and the *worse* because of *choice*; whether this proceed ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐλέγχου ἄγνοιαν, or whether it be τὸ ἐκ σημείου (ἀσυλλόγιστον γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο) it matters not; but I am sure it is *sophisticall*. The *Doctrine of Justification*, which I *reflected* on; I did not say was neere to *Errour*, or *almost an Errour*, but *neere to Socinianisme* or *almost Socinian*: If M. B. takes *Errour* and *Socinianisme* to be *termes convertible*, I must crave liberty to *dissent*. That which is *almost errour*, is *true*: but that which is *almost Socinianisme* may be *quite an Errour*, though not an errour *quite so bad*, as that of the *Socinians* concerning the same matter. He that shall deny the *imputation* of the *Righteousnesse* of Christ, and maintaine that our *performance* of new obedience is the *matter of our Justification* before God, according to the *tenour of the New Covenant*, and yet grant the *satisfaction of* Christ, and assigne it a place (some or other) in the *businesse* of our Justification, his doctrine is but *almost Socinian*, and yet in my *Judgment* is altogether an Errour. And so the *heat* of this first *Conflict* is allayed, *Pulveris exigui jactu*: Its foundation having been only ἀμεβία ἀνθολκῆς.

But notwithstanding this *seeming discharge*, perhaps it may be *said*, that indeed this was not an *honest Insinuation*; there being no such *doctrines* abroad amongst us, as hold any *blameable correspondency* with the *Socinian* doctrine of *justification*; And it is not

an

an *ingenious and candid* way of proceeding, to seeke to *oppresse* truths, or at least *opinions*, that are managed with a *faire* and *learned* plea, with names of *publique Abomination*, with which indeed they have *no* cõmunion. I confes this is *an unworthy* course, a *path* wherein I am not *desirous* to walke: I shall therefore from their *owne writings* give the *Reader* a briefe *summary* in some few *propositions*, of the *doctrine* of the *Socinians* concerning *justification*, and then *nakedly* without *deprecating* his censure, leave him to judg of the *necessity* and candor of my forementioned expressions. They say then, that

1. Justifying faith, or that faith whereby we are justified, is our receiving of Christ, as our Lord & Saviour, trusting in him, and yeilding obedience to him.

Credere in Jesum Christum, nihil aliud est, quàm Jesu Christo confidere, & idcirco ex ejus præscripto vitam instituere. Socin: Justificat: Synop: 2. p. 17. fides est fiducia per deum in Christum, unde apparet, eam in Christo fidem duo comprehendere: unum, ut non solùm deo, verùm & Christo confidamus: deinde ut deo obtemperemus, &c: Catech: Racov: Cap: 9. de fide: vide Volkel. de verâ religione, lib: 4. Cap: 3. p. 179, 180. Smalc: refut: Thes: Franz: disput: 4. p. 103. & disp: 6. p. 184. Credere in Christum nihil aliud est; quàm illi confidere, hoc est, ipsi, sub spe promissionum, ab eo nobis factarum, obedire &c. Smalc: Refut: Thes. Franz: disp: 7. p 209. fides in Christum est, fiduciam in eum collocare, & credere illũ esse omnibus obtemperantibus sibi æternæ salutis causam. Si propriè & stricte sumatur ab obedientiâ differt. Sed per Metonymiam quandam synechdochicam, sæpe tam latè sumitur, ut omnia pietatis & justitiæ opera comprehendat: Schlichtingr Comment: in Cap: 11. ad Heb: p. 519. Quid est Credere in nomen Christi? Resp: eum excipere, ejus dictis fidem habere, ei confidere, ei denique obtemperare: Dialog: Anon: de justifi: p 4. Ex his quæ hactenus dicta sunt, satis intelligi potest, etiamsi verissimum sit, quemadmodum scriptura apertissimè testatur, nos per mortem Christi, perque Sanguinis ejus fusionem servatos esse, nostraque peccata deleta fuisse, non tantùm hoc ipsum credere, esse eam fidem in Christum, quâ, ut Sacræ literæ docent, justificamur, id quod multi & olim putarunt, & hodie putant, adeóque similiter credunt: longè enim aliud est, istud credere, & sub spe

vitæ æternæ ab ipso consequendæ, Christo obedire; quod necessariò requiri ad justificationem nostram, antea à nobis demonstratum est. fragment: de justific: Faust: Socin: Opusc: p. 115. That

2. Faith in justifying is not to be considered as an hand whereby we lay hold on the righteousness of another, or as an instrument, as though Righteousness were provided for us, & tendred unto us, which would overthrow all necessity of being Righteous in our selves.

Patet quàm ineptè *Meisnerus* fidem vocet causam instrumentalem, quâ justificationem (seu justitiam) apprehendamus, seu recipiamus; patet denique quàm falsò (qui error ex priore Consequitur) fidem, quæ virtus aut opus est, justificare neget. Quid magis perversum, & Sacris literis adversum dici potuit? parum nobis fuerat, omnes reliquas virtutes, & pia opera, à comparandâ nobis salute excludere, nisi etiam ipsam in deo fidem, virtutum omnium matrem & reginam, de suo solio deturbatam, tam fædâ ignominiâ notasset. fidem perverse prorsus intelligitis, non enim tanquam conditionem adipiscendæ justificationis consideratis, sed tanquam *instrumentum* vel manum &c: Jo: Schlicting: disput: pro Faust: Socin: ad *Meisner*: p. 129. 130, 131. de eo quod homo justitiam accipiat, nihil legitur in sacris literis, & si id explicetur ex mente adversariorum, ridicula est fabula; fides verò non est accuratè loquendo causa instrumentalis, sed causa *sine qua non* (efficiens) justificationis nostræ. Smal: Refut: Thes: Franz: disp: 4 p. 103.

3. Nor yet doth faith, repentance, or obedience, procure our justification, or is the efficient or meritorious cause thereof.

Ut autem cavendum est, ne ut hodie pleriq; faciunt, vitæ sanctimoniam atq; innocentiam, effectū justificationis nostræ coram deo esse dicamus; sic diligenter cavere debemus, ne ipsā vitæ sanctitatē atq; innocentiam, justificationem nostrā coram deo esse credamus, neve illam nostræ justificationis coram deo causam efficientē, aut impulsivam esse affirmemus. Sed tantummodo &c: Socin: Justific: Synop: 2. p. 14. fides justificationem non meretur, neque est ejus causa efficiens; non ignoramus fidei nostræ nequaquam esse ea merita, quibus justificatio quâ sempiterna continetur felicitas, tanquam merces debita, sit tribuenda. Hinc porrò consequitur, fidem istam, quamvis obedientiam & pietatem in se comprehendat, nequaquam tamen per se, & principaliter efficere, ut justificationis

cationis beneficium consequamur. *Volkel. de verâ Relig. lib. 4. cap. 3 pag. 181. Smal. Refut. Thes. Franz. disput. 4, 5, 7:* obedientia nostra quam Christo præstamus, nec efficiens, nec meritoria causa est nostræ justificationis. *Socin Thes. de justif. p. 17. vide Anonym. Dialog. de justif. pag. 32.*

4 But the true use of our faith (and repentance) as to our justification before God, is, that they are the causa sine quâ non, or the condition whereby according to the appointment of God, we come to be justified: and so is imputed to us:

Diligenter cavere debemus, ne vitæ sanctitatem & innocentiam, justificationem nostram coram Deo esse credamus, neve illam nostræ coram Deo justificationis causam efficientem, aut impulsivam esse affirmemus, sed tantummodo *causam sine quâ* eam justificationem nobis non contingere decrevit Deus. *Socin. Synop. justif. 2. p. 14.* id à nobis revera exegit, ut in Christum credamus, vitam emendaremus (quam conditionem Salvâ sanctitate & majestate suâ non poterat non exigere) *Crel. de Causis mort. Christi. pag. 5.* Interim tamen sic habendum est, cum Deus non nisi illis, qui fidem virtutémque pro suâ virili parte colunt, vitam sempiternam designaverit, fiduciam istam ne quidem causam meritoriam, aut principaliter efficientem, sed causam sine quâ non (ut loquuntur) justificationis nostræ esse. *Volkel. de verâ Relig. lib. 4 cap. 3 pag. 181.* Quod verò ad nos pertinet, non aliter reipsa justi coram Deo habemur, & delictorum nostrorum veniam ab ipso consequimur, quàm si in Jes. Christ. credamus. *Socin. Justif. Synop. 2. pag. 11.*

Itáque nemo justificatus est coram Deo, nisi priùs Christo confidat, eique obediat. Quæ obedientia sunt illa opera ex quibus nos justificari Jacobus Apostolus affirmat. Socin Thes. de justif. pag. 14. Sunt enim opera nostra, id est, ut dictum fuit, obedientia, quam Christo præstamus, licèt nec efficiens nec meritoria, tamen causa (ut vocant) Sine quâ non justificationis coram Deo, atque æternæ salutis nostræ, id. ibid. imputatur nobis a Deo id quod revera in nobis est, non aliquid quod à nobis absit, vel in alio sit, nempe quod firmiter in animo decreverimus nihil dubitantes de Dei promissionibus, neque considerantes nostram infirmitatem nos propositum fidei certamen decurrere velle. Anonym. Dialog. de justifi. pag. 29. (hæc vero corrigit Faustus Socin. Notæ in Dial. pag. 64. beatitatem & remissionem peccatorum

nobis imputari asserens.) Certum est ex Sacris literis requiri ad hoc, ut quis consequatur apud Deum Remissionem peccatorum, & ita coram Deo justificetur, ut de illo meritò dici possit, quod pactum Dei servet. Fragment. de justif. Apparet Paulum absolutè intelligere opera quæcúnq; tandem illa sunt. Quod tamen non eam vim habet, ut à causâ justificationis nostræ omnium quæcunq; opera, & quocunq; modo considerata, excludere velit. Sed sensus ipsius est, nulla esse opera quæ tanti sint, ut propter ipsorum meritum justificari possimus. Quando scilicet nemo est, qui perfectissimè & integerrimè per totam vitam, ea opera faciat, quæ sub vetere sive sub novo Testamento præscripta sunt, id quod tamen omnino requiritur, sive requiretur ad hoc, ut pro ipsâ operâ tanquam ejus rei aliquo modo meritoria, justificatio contingeret. Diximus autem aliquo modo meritoria, ut ab ipsis operibus excludamus, non modò absolutum & maximè proprium meritum, quod oritur ex ipsâ operum præstantiâ per se consideratâ. Sed etiam illud, quod minùs propriè & respectivè meritum est, quod ex solo Dei promisso oritur ac proficiscitur, adeò ut nemo nec per illud, neque per hoc meritum, suorum operum justificationem, & absolutionem a peccatis suis, adipiscatur, &c. vid. Plu. *fragm. de justificat. Faust. Socin. pag.* 110. Cum Paulus negat nos ex operibus justificari, considerat opera tanquam meritoria, & sua ipsorum vi hominem justificantia, & consequenter ejusmodi, quibus si ad Dei præceptum examinentur, nihil prorsus desit; at Jacobus operum nomine eam obedientiam intelligit; sine quâ Deus hominem sibi carum habere non vult; seu mavis opera ejusmodi sine quibus dici nequeat, ullâ ratione hominem Deo obedire: ex hâc collatione ipsorum duorum Pauli & Jacobi locorum, & sententiarum, manifestum est, quemadmodum ad justificationem nostram non requiritur necessario perfecta obedientia mandatorum Dei, sic ad eandem justificationem omnino requiri, ut Dei mandata ita conservaremus, ut meritò dici possit nos Deo obedientes esse. Fragm. Faust. pag. 122.

5 That our justification, is our Absolution from the guilt of sinne, and freedome from obnoxiousnes unto punishment for it, and nothing else. Our Regeneration is the Cnudition of our Absolution, and in them both, in several respects is our Righteousnes.

Justificatio

Justificatio est cum nos Deus pro justis habet, quod eâ ratione facit, cum nobis & peccata remittit, & jus vitæ donat. Catech. Racov. cap. 11. de Justificat. Justificatio nihil aliud est, quam peccatorum Remissio. Schlcting. contra Trinit. pag. 147. Justificatio nostra coram Deo, ut uno verbo dicam, nihil aliud est quam à Deo pro justis haberi: hoc vero fit per absolutionem peccatorum. Socin. Synop. Justif. 2. pag. 11. Justificatio nihil aliud est, quam pro justo habere, itemque peccata remittere & condonare. id. pag 13. 14. Quæro primùm quid sit Justificatio? R. peccatorum absolutio Anon. (ni fallor O storod) dial: de Justifi: p. 2. Hic tacitè continetur ea sententia, quam nos supra ab initio attigimus, & non obscurè refutavimus, justificationē vid: à justo faciendo dici, & à justitiâ ac sanctitate quâ quis sit præditus; cum tamen certissimum sit, justificationem in Sacris literis aliud nihil significare, quàm justum pronuntiare, sive ut justum tractare. Faust. Socin. notæ in Dial. de justif. pag 60. Sed manifestum est Paulum negare, non modò ex operibus legis, sed simpliciter, ex operibus nos justificari; Itáque aliâ ratione omnino est hic nodus solvendus, & dicendum, Paulum, operum nomine non quælibet opera intelligere, nec quolibet modo accepto, sed quæ suâ vi hominem justum coram Deo reddere possunt, cum negat nos ex operibus justificari, qualis est absoluta & perpetua per totum vitæ curriculum legis divinæ observatio Faust. Socin. notæ in Dial. de Justif. pag. 74.

Formalis itáque (ut ita loquar) justificatio nostra coram Deo fuit, & semper erit, propter carnis nostræ infirmitatem, remissio peccatorum nostrorum, non autem impletio divinæ legis, quod Paulus *operari* vocat. Veruntamen nulli re ipsâ conceditur ista remissio, nisi Deo confisus fuerit, seque ipsi regendum & gubernandum tradiderit. *Faust. Socin. Epist. ad Virum Clariss. de fide & operibus.*

6 That the way whereby we come to obtaine this absolution is this: Jesus Christ the only Son of God, being sent by him to reveal his love and Grace to lost sinful mankind, in that work yeilding obedience unto God even unto death, was for a reward of that obedience, exalted, and had divine authority over them for whom he dyed, committed to him, to pardon and save them, which accordingly he doth, upon the performance of the condition of faith and obedience by him prescribed

scribed to them, at once effecting an universal conditional application of all: actually justifying every individual upon the performance of the Condition.

Ipsi Jesu, tantam in cœlo & terrâ, tanquam obedientiæ scilicet usque ad mortem crucis insigne præmium, potestatem dedit, ut eis, &c. Socin. Synop. Justific. 1. pag. 4. Interea tamen haudquaquam negamus, Christi mortem, conditionem quandam fuisse remissionis peccatorum nobis concedendæ: quatenus conditio fuit Christo imposita, sine quâ potestatem obtinere ex Dei decreto non potuit, peccata nobis remittendi, & nos ab æterno interitu vindicandi. *Crel. de Cauſ. mort. Christ. pag.* 8. (Paulus ea à fide opera removet, quæ perpetuam perfectissimámque, per omnem vitæ cursum obedientiam continent. Jacobus ergo ea intelligit Volkel. de verâ Relig. lib. 4. cap. 3. pag. 180. ad 461.) vide plura.

Quia nos Christus ab æternâ morte liberavit, & ut nos liberare posset, mortuus est, jure dicitur eum pro nobis, & pro peccatis nostris mortuum esse, & sanguinem ipsius nos emundare à peccatis: neque enim nos dicimus, Christum ob hoc vel solum vel principale obediviſſe, ut nos ad se imitandum extimularet, sed constantissime affirmamus, illum ideò patri suo obedientem, & pro nobis mortuum fuisse, ut potestatem divinam, interveniente morte sua, consecutus, salutem nostram administrare, & tandem reipsâ perficere posset. *Smal. Refut. Thes. Fran. disp.* 4. *pag.* 108. Quamvis autem certissimum ac testatissimum sit, Jesum Christum Dei filium sanguinem suum in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum fudisse: Tamen ipsa mors Christi per se sine Resurrectione, &c. *Socin. Thes. de justific. Thes.* 3. *vid. fragm. de justificat. pag.* 115.

7. That as to good works, and their place in this business, Paul speaks of the perfect works of the law, and legal manner of justifying, which leave no place for Grace or pardon: James of Gospel works of new obedience, which leave place for both.

Sola fides justificat, at non quatenus sola, præsertim si de plenâ & permanente justificatione loquamur, quatenus quibusvis bonis operibus opponitur. Hoc est particula exclusiva sola, non quævis opera, sed opera de quibus Apostolus loquitur, opera legis, opera plena, ob quæ non secundum gratiam justificatio imputatur,

tur, sed secundum debitum tribuitur, excludit. Non excludit autem ullo pacto opera ex fide provenientia, cum Jacobus expertissimè doceat, hominem justificari ex operibus, non ex fide tantum: Schlichting disput. pro Socin. ad Meisner. pag. 290 291. In iis locis, ubi Apostolus fidem operibus opponit, de operibus ejusmodi agit, quæ & perfectam & perpetuam obedientiam continent, qualem sub lege Deus ab hominibus requirebat: Verùm non de iis operibus, quæ obedientiam, quam Deus à nobis qui in Christum credidimus, requirat, comprehendunt. Racov. Catech. cap. 9. de fide. Hinc jam demum intelligo non bona opera, quæ Deus ipse præparavit, sed legis opera à justificatione nostrâ excludi. Anonym. Dial. de Justif. pag. 47.

8 That the denial of our faith and obedience to be the condition of our justification, or the asserting that we are justified by the obedience of Christ imputed to us, is the ready way to overthrow all obedience, and drive all holyness and Righteousness out of the world.

Quod Christus factus sit nobis à Deo justitia. 1 *Cor.* 1. 3. id minimè eo sensu dici, quasi loco nostri legem impleverit, sic ut nobis deinceps ipsius justitia imputetur, &c. *Schlichting ad Meisn. disput. pro Socin. pag.* 277. Tertius error est, Deum imputare credentibus innocentiam & justitiam Christi: Non innocentiam, non justitiam Christi Deus imputat credentibus, sed fidem illorum illis imputat pro justitiâ. *Smal. refut. Thes. Franz disput.* 4 *p.* 104. alterum est extremum, quod vulgò receptum est, non sine summâ animarum pernicie; Videlicet, ad justificationem nostram nihil prorsus bona opera pertinere, nisi quatenus sunt ipsius justificationis effecta. Ubi qui ita sentiunt &c. idem.

9 That as the beginning, so the continuance of our justification, depends on the condition of our faith, repentance, and obedience, which are not fruits consequent of it; but conditions antecedent to it. Socin. Thes. de justificat. p. 18. Fragmenta de justific. p. 113 and therefore in the first place we are to be sollicitous about what is within us, about our sanctification, before our absolution or justification. Socin. Epist ad Ch. M N. de fide & operibus. Sic tandem apparet vestigationem nostram circa ea esse debere, quæ in nobis invenientur, cum justificati sumus—Quocir-

ea diligenter primùm vestigare debemus an res istæ, sive utráque, sive una tantùm, & utra (si modò res diversæ sint) ad nos justificandos pertineat, ac deinde quid sint, aut quales esse debeant, ne erremus, nobísque videamur illas habere, cùm tamen longè ab eis absimus. Quod enim ad misericordiam Dei attinet, Christíque personam, una cum iis omnibus quæ idem Christus pro nobis fecit, & facturus est, quamvis hæ sunt veræ, & præcipuæ causæ justificationis nostræ, tamen aut jam illarum sumus, erimúsve participes, antequam intra nos certum aliquid sit, & sic supervacaneum est de illis cogitare, quatenus per ea justificari velimus: aut illarum, nec jam sumus, nec futuri erimus participes, nisi priùs intra nos certum aliquid sit, & sic de hoc accuratè quærere debemus, id autem nihil est, præter fidem & opera. *Socin.*

10 **As to the death of Christ, our sinnes were the impulsive cause of it, and it was undergone for the forgivenes of sins, and occasioned by them only, and is in some sence, the condition of our forgivenes.**

Causa impulsiva externa sunt peccata nostra, quod itidem apertè Sacræ literæ docent, dum aiunt, Christum propter peccata nostra percussum, vulneratum, & traditum esse. *Crel. de Caus. mort. Christ. p.* 2. What was the procuring cause of Christ's death?

A: He was delivered for offences, *Biddles Cat. Chap.* 12. *p.* 69. Though some (not of them) say, that his death was rather *occasioned*, then *merited* by sinne; as they speak sometimes. Finis ideò mortis Christi, ut sacræ literæ sat apertè docent, est remissio peccatorum nostrorum, & vitæ nostræ emendatio, ad quorum finem priorem vel solùm, vel potissimum, illi loquendi modi referendi sunt: Cum dicitur Christum mortuum esse pro peccatis nostris, seu pro nobis. *Crel. de caus. mort. Christ. pag.* 1.

11 **That absolution and pardon of sinne are by no meanes, the immediate effects of the death of Christ.**

Cùm Sacræ Scripturæ asserunt Christum aut pro peccatis nostris, aut pro nobis esse mortuum, aut sanguinem ejus esse effusum in remissionem peccatorum, & siqua sint his similia, eorum verborum ea vis non est, ut significent omnino effectum illum, qui morti Christi in his locutionibus tribuitur, proximè fuisse

ex

ex eâ consecutos. *Crell. de Caus. mort. Christi. p.* 35.

And now let the Christian *Reader* judge, whether I had any *just occasion* for the expressions *above mentioned* or no; if he be resolved that *those* wordes had *better been omitted*, I shall only profess my selfe in a very great readinesse *to passe by* such mistakes in others, but leave my selfe to his censure.

And with this *touch* by the *way* am I (as farre as I *have observed*) dismissed to the *eigth chapter*; where all that I am concerned in will receive an *equally* speedy dispatch.

In the entrance of that *Chapter*, *M. B.* laies downe two *propositions* that he *rejects*, and *another* that he intends to prove.

Those he rejects were before mentioned, and my concernment in them spoken to.

That which he proposes unto confirmation, is:

The Justification by Faith, so called in the Scripture, is not the knowledge or feeling of Justification before given, or a Justification in, and by our own Conscience, or terminated in conscience; but is somewhat that goes before all such Justification as this is, and is indeed a Justification before God.

There is but *one Expression* in all this Proposition, that I am *concerned* in; which the *Reader* may easily discover to be pluckt into the *thesis* by *head and eares!* & that is, *terminated in conscience*. What it is *I* intend by that *Expression*, or what *inconsistency* it hath with that *M. B.* asserts in pretēded *oppositiō* unto it, he doth not explain Now I say, that in the *sense*, wherein I affirme that *Justification* is *terminated in conscience*, I may yet also *affirme*, and that *suitably* to the utmost *intention* of mine in that *expression*, that *Justification by Faith is not a knowledge or feeling of Justification before given*, nor a *justification in, or by our own Consciences*, but somewhat that goes *before all such justification* as *this* is, *and is a justification before God*; *I* am then utterly *unconcerned in* all *M. B's. Arguments* ensuing, but only *those* that *prove* and *evince*, that our *justification before God* is not *terminated* in our Consciences: which when I *can find* them out, I will do my endeavour to *answer* them, or renounce my *Opinion*. I find indeed in some of his following *Conclusions* the *words* mentioned; but I suppose he thought not *himselfe* that they were any way *influenced* from his *Premises*. I know he will not aske, what I meane then by *terminated in Conscience*; seeing it would not be *honourable* for him to have answered a *mat-*

ter, before he underſtood it. But upon this *Expreſſion* chiefly is it, that I am *enrolled* into the *troope* of *Antinomians*.

———Ὁ δὲ ὁρῶν τὸς νόμους
Λίαν ἀκριβῶς συκοφάντης φαίνεται.

But that is in the *matter of lawes*; theſe *are* but *words*. Now though I have juſt cauſe to abſtain from calling in *Aſſociates* in my *Judgment*, leaſt I ſhould bring them under the *Suſpicion* of *Antinomianiſme*; (though not of the *ruder* ſort) (pag 190.) or at leaſt of laying the *foundation* of *Antinomianiſme*, which *M. Burg.* after all *his paines* againſt them, is *ſaid* to do: (*Præf:*) (but the beſt is, that he does it *ſuperficially* and *without preofe*) (*Præf:*) And although I cannot *come up* to the judgment of the *man*, whom I ſhall *name*; yet being he is *deſervedly* of good *eſteeme* in the judgment of *others*, and *particularly* of *M. B.* for his oppoſition to the *Antinomians*, I will for *once* make uſe of his *Authority* for my *ſhield* in this *buſineſſe*; and ſee if in this *ſtorme* I can lye *ſafe* behind it. It is *M. Rutherfurt*, who in his *learned Exercitations De gratiâ.* Exercit: 1. Cap. 2. Tit *Quomodo juſtificamur fide*; having treated of the matter of Juſtification pag. 44. thus proceeds: *Dicent ergò Arminiani, nos hic juſtificationem ſumere pro ſenſu & notitiâ juſtificationis: ideóque Homines fide juſtificantur, idem valet, ac Homines tum demum juſtificantur, quando credunt, hoc eſt, ſentiunt ſe juſtificari, cùm anteà eſſent juſtificati. Nugæ & tricæ ſiculæ! nam juſtificari eſt plus quàm ſentire ſe juſtificari: Nam* (1) *eſt Actus dei abſolventis terminatus in conſcientiâ hominis, citati & tracti ad tribunale tremendi judicis; qui actus ante hoc inſtans non terminabatur in conſcientiâ &c.* Now if this man be an *Antinomian*, I am *ſure* he much miſtakes himſelfe; and yet he ſaies juſtification may *be terminated* in *conſcience* and, yet not be a ſenſe of an *antecedent juſtification*, nor *from Eternity*.

But how it may *fare* with him, I cannot *gueſſe*; *M. Pemble*, and *D. Twiſſe*, (*quanta nomina*) are in the next *page recounted* as the *Aſſertors* of the *poſition* here oppoſed by *M. B.* & *indeed* as to ſome part of it they are, by *yet*, if *I durſt ſay it*, they were not *Antinomians:* but *M. B.* knowes *theſe things* better then *I*.

But what ſay I to the *whole* poſition? pag: 190. *One learned man* (ſo am I called, that the *ſacrifice* may not fall without ſome *flowers* on it's *head*; which I *profeſſedly ſhake off*, and dare not owne *my name* amongſt them who *are*, or *ought* to be ſo ſtil'd) *ſaith, that Abſolution*

ſolution in heaven, and juſtification differ as part and whole, and that juſtification is terminated in conſcience, and ſo makes a longer worke of juſtification then they, that ſay it is ſimul & ſemel, *or then I, whom M. Cr. blames for it; and ſo that whole begun in eternall Abſolution, (or from Chriſt's death,) and ended in conſcience, ſhould contain* immanent *and* tranſient *Acts together, and no ſmall number of our owne, as there deſcribed.*

Anſ. Though I do not *perfectly* underſtand the *Coherence* of *theſe* words, yet the *intendment* of them being more *obvious* (and being my ſelfe in great haſt) I ſhall not *ſtay* to make any further enquiry thereabout.

What I meane by *Abſolution in heaven,* the Reader if he *pleaſe* may ſee, chap: 12. pag: 75. 76, 77, 78. of that Treatiſe, whence *M. B. urges* theſe expreſſions: It is neither *eternall Abſolution,* nor Abſolution from Chriſt's death (if *from* denote a *ſimulty* of *time*, and not a *connexion* in reſpect of *cauſality*, in which ſenſe *M. B.* will not deny that *Abſolution is from Chriſts death*) but an *Abſolution* at the *time* of *actuall juſtification*, when God gives Chriſt to us, and with him all things, that I intend.

That by aſſerting this *Abſolution in heaven,* and *juſtification* to differ as *part and whole*, and *juſtification* to be *terminated in conſcience*, I make longer worke of it, then thoſe, who ſay it is *ſimul & ſemel*, is *ſaid*; *ſimul & ſemel*, referre unto *time*, I expreſly affirme as *M. B.* knowes (or ought to have knowne,) that there is in theſe *things* an *order* of Nature only. At the *ſame time* wherein God *abſolves us in heaven,* (the terme of the *ſtipulation* for our deliverance being accomp'iſhed) by *reckoning Chriſt* to us, or in making him righteouſneſs to us, He *infuſes a principle of life* into *our ſoules*, whereby *radically*, and *virtually* the whole is accompliſhed.

That *actuall juſtification* ſhould *containe permanent* and *tranſient Acts* together, and that it is ſo by me deſcribed, is affirmed by *a failure of M. B's memory*. Having made this *entrance* and *progreſſe*, adding the judgment of *ſome*, whom he cals *moſt learned and judicious* (as he is *perſpicax ingeniorum arbiter*) He concludes his firſt *ſection* in theſe words: *ſo that howſoever ſome by plauſible words would put a better face on it, the ſenſe of all ſeemes to be the ſame, that Juſtification by Faith is the revelation of God in, and by the conſcience, that We are formerly juſtified; and ſo their juſtification*

by faith, is the same that we commonly call the Assurance or knowledg of our Justification, in some degrees at least, I prove the contrary: and so fals he into his Arguments.

That this is *my sense*, I profess *I knew not before*; and should be *sorry* I should dwell *so little at home*, that *M. B.* should know *me*, and my *mind*, better then I do my selfe. I looke upon him as my *friend*: and

Τὰ τῶν φίλων κοινὰ, ἃ μόνον τὰ χρήματα,
Καὶ νῦς δὲ, καὶ σφωνήσεως κοινωνία.

But yet he may *possibly* be *mistaken*; for the present I will make *bold* to *deny this to be my sense*, and *referre the Reader* for Evidence to be given to my *negation*, unto that *chapter* of my booke, whence *M. B. gathers* my *sense* and meaning. Let them *then* that are *concerned* looke to his *following Arguments* (especially those *two* whom he affirmes to have *more wit then the rest*, p: 204.) and wo be to them, if they find as many *distinct mediums* as there are *figures* hung up as *signes* of *new* Arguments. For my owne part, whatever my *thoughts* are to the *whole businesse* pleaded about, I shall not, (be they as *mean* and *base* as can be imagined;) cast them away in such a *scambling Chase* as this. Only whereas pag. 205. speaking to *some body*, (I know not whom) whom he *acknowledges to have some learning and wit*, he saies, *that the Act of the promise, law, or grant, constituting Right, giving Title, remitting the obligation to punishment, in its selfe, is totally distinct from the Act of declaring this to our selves, which is said to be terminated in conscience, and is before it, and may be without it &c.* I shall (if it please him) desire, that it may only with a little *alteration* be thus rendred; *The Act of the promise* (not that I approve that expression, but at present it will serve the turne) *giving Right &c. is compleat Justification by Faith, and is in its selfe totally distinct from, and in order of time before any act of God justifying terminated in our consciences*, and proved with *one cleare Testimony* or *Argument* speaking to the *termes* and *sense* of the proposition, And I shall confess my selfe, as to what I have as yet *published* of my *judgment* about this business, to be concerned in the discourse; and so passing through the *pikes* of 56 *Arguments*, I come to the *ninth chapter* where I am *againe* called to an account; *Three* things doth *M. B.* propose to *confirmation* in this chapter.

1. *That the Elect are not justified from eternity.*

2. *That*

2. *That they are not justified at Christ's death.*

3. *Not while they are infidells and impenitent.*

Any man *living* would *wonder* how I should come to *stand* in his way in this *chapter*. But *strong currents* sometimes *passe* their *bounds* in their courses, and bare all before them. *Reall*, or *reputed* success gives great *thoughts* and pretexts for any thing, αἱ γὰρ εὐπραξίαι δεινὰ συγκρύψαι καὶ συσκιάσαι τοιαῦτα ὀνείδη (*Demost: Olymp:*) In the very *Treatise* which *M. B. considers* in *these imputations*, I have expresly *denyed*, (and in *particular to M. B.*) that I maintaine any *one* of these; if he should send but his *servant*, and tell me, that he is not to be *found in such an opinion*, I would believe him. But *quid verba audiat facta cum videat?* If I do *maintaine them indeed*, must I be *believed* upon my deniall? but, *en tabulas!* let my booke *traduced* be consulted. I dispute as well as *I can* against *justification from eternity*; and that I cannot do it *like M. B.* is my *unhappinesse*, not my *Crime*; I hope every one must not be *sentenced* to be of an *opinion* which he cannot confute so *learnedly*, as another *more learned* man may. For *justification* at the *death of Christ* (though I must assure the Reader, that I have *other thoughts* of the great Transaction of the business of our *salvation* in the *person of our Representative*, then are consistent with *M.B's. principles*, or then I *have yet* published, wherein I have the *consent* of persons as *eminently insighted* in the *mystery of the Gospell*, as any I know in the world) I *directly* affirme, and endeavour to *prove* that the *Elect* are not then *actually* justified; but *notwithstanding* what is done for them, untill their owne *actuall believing*, they are obnoxious to the law &c. as at large *chap.* 12. p. 75. of that Treatise, which includes *the last particular also.*

But we must proceed, *non qua eundum est sed qua itur*; in the entrance of *his ninth chapter* M. B. attempts to prove, that *the Elect are not justified from eternity*, and concludes his discourse; The *words of one that writes this way are these: Here two things may be observed.*

1. *What we ascribe to the merit of Christ*, viz: *the accomplishment of the condition, which God required to make way, that the Obligation which he had freely put upon himselfe might be in actuall force: and so much (I leave to himselfe to consider how rightly) doth M. B. assigne to our workes*; Thes: 26.

And all know, that a condition as such, is no cause, but an antecedent

dent, or causa sine qua non. *And is not the death of Christ here fairely advanced, and his merits well vindicated? My constant affirmation is, and still was, that mans workes are not in the least degree truly and properly meritorious, and that they are such meer Conditions of our salvation, (not of our first justification) as that they are no causes of any right we have (no not to a bit of bread, much lesse) to heaven. Do not these men well defend the honour of Christs merits then, if they give no more to them, then I do to mans workes? that is, not to be the meritorious cause so much as of an houres temporall mercy; that is, to be properly no merit at all: It seemes to me therefore that they do by their doctrine of eternall justification or pardon, not only destroy justification by Faith, but also all the merits of Christ, and leave nothing for them to do, for the causing of our pardon or justification before God. Nay, whether this learned man can make Christ's sufferings, and obedience, so much as a bare condition, let them consider that read him affirming, that conditions properly must be uncertaine, and nothing is so to God: therefore there can be no condition with God, therefore Christ's death could be no more.*

En cor Zenodoti, en jecur Cratetis.

What is most *admirable* in this discourse I know not.

1. I am *suggested* to maintaine *justification from eternity*: *I am one that write that way*; I am one that that by the *doctrine of justification from eternity, overthrow justification by Faith*, & the *merits* of Christ. What I shall say more to this *businesse* I know not: the *Comœdian* tels me all that I can say is in vaine.

Ne admittam culpam ego meo sum promus pectori
Suspicio est in pectore alieno sita.
Nam nunc ego te si surripuisse suspicer
Jovi coronam de capite è capitolio
Quod in culmine astat summo; si non id feceris.
Atque id tamen mihi lubeat suspicarier,
Qui tu id prohibere me potes ne suspicer? Plaut.

2. Me thinkes it had been *equal*, that *M. B.* who requires (*δικαίως*) that men *judge not any thing in his Aphorismes*, but according as it is *interpreted*, in this his *confession*, should have *interpreted* this *passage* of mine, by the *Analogie* of what I have written in the *same book* about the death of Christ and *merit* thereof. He would have found (*and in these things doth my soule live*) that all the *Mercy*, *Grace*, or *Priviledges* whatever

whatever, of what sort soever, that in this *Life* we are made partakers of, all the *Glory*, *Honour*, and *Immortality* that we are *begotten* a new to an *hope* of, is by me *every where ascribed* to the death of Christ, and the merit thereof, as the *sole causa περιαπτικὴ* of them all. The *making out of this* takes up the greatest part of my *writings* and *preaching*. I can *truly say*, that I *desire to know nothing but Christ*, and *him crucified*; And *I shall* labour to make the *Honour*, *Glory*, *Exaltation*, and *Triumph* of the *cross* of Christ, the whole of my *ayme* and *businesse* in this world. May I be convinced of *speaking*, *uttering*, *writing* any *one word* to the *derogation* of the *honour*, *efficacy*, *power* of the *death* and merits of our dear Lord Jesus, I shall *quickly* lay my *mouth in the dust*, and give my selfe to be *trampled* on by the feet of men, which perhaps *on other accounts* I am only meet for. It is only that *Christ may have the preheminence in all things*, that I will *voluntarily* contend with any living. That as a *King*, and *Priest*, and *Prophet*, he may be *only*, and *all* in his *Church*, is the *designe* of my *contesting*.

But is not this *expression* to the *derogation* of his *merits*? I say if it *be*, I disavow it, *condemne* it, *reject it*. If the *intendment* of the *expression* be not, that the Lord Jesus Christ, by the *performance* of what was *prescribed* to him of his *Father*, that he might *save us to the utmost*, according to the *compact* between *Father* and *Son*, did *merit*, *purchase*, and *procure* for us all the *grace*, mercy, salvation promised in the *new Covenant*, I desire here to *condemne* it. But if that be the *sense* of it (as the words immediately going before, with the whole tenour of the discourse doe undeniably evince) I would desire *M. B.* a little to reflect upon his *dealings* with other men, upon their *pretended* mistakes, in representing *him* and his judgment to the world. All the *Advantage* that is given to this *Harangue* is from the Ambiguity of the word *condition*. It is evident that I take it here in a *large sense* for the whole *prescription* of Obedience unto the *Lord Jesus*, whereupon the *promise* of all the good things, that are the *fruits* of his death, is *made* to him, which being grounded in *voluntary compact*, and laid *thereby* in due *proportion*, gives *rise to merit properly* and *strictly* so called. If the Reader desire farther *satisfaction* herein, let him but *read that very Treatise* which *M. B. excepts against*, where he will find *abundantly* enough for the clearing of my intendment. Or to him, that *looses his time* in *perusing* this *Appendix*, I shall recommend the

foregoing *Treatise*, for the same purpose.

3. For what *M. B. ascribes* to our *workes*, I shall not (for *my part*) much trouble my selfe whilst I live, being *little* or not *at all* concerned therein: He is not for me to *deal* with.

Τίκτει τοὶ κόρος ὕβριν ὅτ' ἂν πολὺ ὄλβος ἕπηται. *Theog.*

If I *dispute* in print any more, (as I hope I shall not) it shall be *with them*, that *understanding* my meaning, will *fairely, closely* and *distinctly* debate the thing in *difference*, and not insisting on words and expressions to no purpose (especially if their own hast allowes them not oftentimes to speak *congruously*) shall *presse* and *drive* the things themselves to their issue.

——Dabitur ignis tamenetsi ab inimicis petam.

M. B. proceeds in his *second* Section to prove, that *all the Elect are not justified at the death of Christ:* In this passage one *expression* of mine, about the *sense* of Rom. 4. 5. is *taken notice* of; but that relates to a *busines* of a *greater importance* then to be now mentioned. Something *M. B.* discourses about the *state* and *condition* of the Elect in reference to *the death* of Christ: some texts to that purpose he considers; but so *jejunely*, so much *below the majesty* of the mystery of Grace in this *particular*, that I shall not make *his discourse an occasion* of what may be offered on that account. Something I have spoken in the former *Treatise*, concerning the *transaction of the compact*, and *Agreement*, that was between the *Father* and *Son*, about the *salvation* of the Elect. Of their *Interest* and *concernement* therein, with the state of his *body*, of those *that were given* him, on that account, God assisting hereafter.

But p. 228. from *words of mine*, which from several *places* of my *Treatise* are put together, he makes sundry *inferences*, and opposes to them all two *conclusions* of his own, pag. 229.

This man (sayes he) *seems to judge, that the name of compleat justification is proper to that in conscience, and not to be given to any before: He seemes also to judge, that justification hath degrees and parts at many* 100 *or* 1000 *years distanced one from another; or else absolution at least hath, which we have hitherto taken for the same thing with justification: For he cals that in conscience compleat justification: so sayth he, absolution in heaven and justification differ as part and whole*; so he

Egregie Cordatus homo Catus Eliu' Sextus!

It seemes M. B, Knowes not what my judgment is, by his repeating, that, *it seemes this is his judgment*; he might have *stayed* from his confutation of it, until he had *Known* it: it is not for his *honour* that he hath done otherwise.

I deny that it is my judgment, that the name of *compleat justification* is *proper* to that in *conscience*. Nor doe I know of any *proper* or *compleat justification in conscience*; I only sayd *compleat justification is terminated in conscience*: If *M. B. know not* what I mean thereby, let him *stay a little*, and *I* shall explaine my selfe.

It is *most false*, that I judge *justification* to have degrees and *parts* at an 100 *or* 1000 *years* distance; unlesse under the *name of justification* you comprise all the *causes* and effects of it, and then it reaches from *everlasting* to *everlasting*.

That *Absolution in Heaven* (as I call it) is before our *actual* believing in *order* of *time*, I have no where sayd, but only in *order* of *nature*; and *that M. B.* hath not disproved.

What *M. B.* thinkes of *absolution* and justification to be the *same*, is no rule to us; when he *proves it*, so it is: but to what *I*, and *others* have sayd, *M. B.* opposes two *conclusions*, pag. 229. whereof the first is.

1. We did neither *really*, nor in God's *account dye with Christ when he dyed*, *nor in him satisfie God's justice*, *nor fulfil the Law*. the second.

2 *Though Christ was given for the Elect more then for others, yet is he no more given to them then to others*; *before they are borne, or before they have faith*.

The *first* of these (he saith) (he meanes *the first of them before mentioned*, which the *first* of these is set down in opposition unto) is of so great *moment, and is the heart and root of so many Errours, yea of the whole body of Antinomiani me, that I had rather write as great a volume as this, &c.*

What it is that *I intended by dying with Christ, M. Baxter* does not *know*, nor *ghesse* neer the matter. The consideration of *God's giving the Elect* to Christ, of his *Constitution* to be a *common person*, a Mediatour and surety, of the whole *compact*, and *Covenant* between *Father* and *Son*, of his *Absolution* as a *common Person*, of the *Sealing*, Confirmation, and the Establishment of the *Covenant* of grace by his death, of the *œconomy* of the Holy Spirit *founded* therein, of the whole *grant* made upon his *Assention*, must pre-

cede the *full* and clear *interpretation* of that expreſſion. For the *preſent* it may ſuffice, *I have not ſayd* that we *did ſatisfie* God's juſtice in him, or *ſatisfie* the Law in him, ſo that we ſhould be (*perſonally* conſidered,) the *principles* of the *ſatisfaction* or obedience; nor that we *ſo dyed* in him, as to be *juſtified*, or abſolved *actually* upon his *death*, before we are borne; ſo that *I* ſhall not be concerned *at all* if *M. Baxter's thoughts* ſhould *encline* him to write a *Volume* as bigge as this, about his *confeſſion*, which is no ſmall content to me.

For the *ſecond*; *that Chriſt was given to the Elect more then others*, *I* ſay not; becauſe *I* ſay, that he was *not given*, as a *Mediatour*, *Price*, and Ranſome for any other at *all*. When the *demonſtrations* that *Chriſt dyed for all*, which *M. Baxter* hath ſomewhile talked of, are *publiſhed*, *I* may perhaps find *cauſe* (if *I* ſee them) to change my *mind*: but as yet *I* doe not *ſuppoſe* that *I* ſhall ſo doe. That he is *given* to *any* before they are *borne*, *I* have not ſayd; though they are *given* to *him* before they are borne, or that he is given to them in *order* of *time* before they doe *believe*; but this *I* ſay, that *faith* and *forgiveneſſe* of ſinne is given them *for his ſake*: which, when *M. Baxter* diſproves, or pretends ſo to doe, *I* ſhall further conſider it, as being a matter of importance: with his *ſtrife of words* (if *I* can chuſe) I ſhall no more *trouble* my ſelfe.

This proceſs being made; *Sect.* 3. *M. Baxter* lays downe the *concluſion* as *contrary* to *them before*, which (as *he informes me*) are maintained by *my ſelfe and others*.

No man now living, was juſtified, pardoned, or abſolved actually from the guilt of ſinne and obligation to death at the time of Chriſt's death or undertaking, or from eternity, or at any time before he was borne, or did believe.

After *I* know not how many *Arguments* brought forth to *confirme* this *poſition*, my *Argments* againſt it are *produced* and *anſwered*; but what the *learned man* meanes *I poſeſſe I* know not: Unleſſe *diſputandi prurigine abreptus*, he *cares* not *what he ſayes*, nor againſt whom, ſoe he may *multiply Arguments and Anſwers*, and put forth *books* one upon another. *In* that *very book* of mine which he *animadverts* upon, *I* uſe ſundry of thoſe very *Arguments*, which here he *uſeth*, to prove the ſame *Aſſertion* for the *ſubſtance* of it, as *M. Baxter* hath *here* layd down. And this *I* had *aſſured* him,

as

as to a *former miſtake* of *his*. My words are pag. 33. as for *Evangelical juſtification*, whereby a ſinner is *compleatly juſtified*, that it ſhould *precede* believing, *I* have *not only not aſſerted*, but *poſitively denied, and diſproved by many Arguments*: *to be now traduced as a Patron of that opinion, and my Reaſons for it publickly unſwered, ſeemes to me ſomewhat uncouth.* Further now to *acquit* my ſelfe from *that*, which nothing but ſelfefulneſs, oſcitancy, and contempt of others can *poſſibly* adminiſter any *ſuſpicion* of, *I* ſhall not turne aſide.

Yea, but *I* have ſaid, that the *Elect upon the death of Chriſt, have a right to all the fruit of the death of Chriſt to be enjoyed in the appointed ſeaſon*: becauſe this is made the *occaſion* of ſo many outcrys of *Antinomianiſme*, and I know not what, *I* ſhall direct the Reader to what *I* have *affirmed* in this caſe, & leave it with ſome brief *Obſervations* to his *judgment*, having ſomewhat *elſe* to *doe*, then to *engage* my ſelfe in a *long wordy* conteſt with *M. Baxter*: who knowing not of any *difference* between himſelfe and me, would *very faigne* make one, wherein he may poſſibly find his labour prevented *hereafter*, and a real difference ſtated between us, if any of his rare *notions* fall in my way.

The diſcourſe is, *pag.* 69. lin. 23. unto *pag.* 72. lin 24.

The ſumme of *all* is this; upon the *death of Chriſt*, that is, on the conſideration of the *death of Chriſt*; upon his *Undertaking*; (for ſurely I ſuppoſe it will be granted, that his *death* was no leſs *effectual* upon his *undertaking* to them who dyed before his *incarnation*, then afterwards upon his actual *accompliſhment* of that undertaking,) to be a *Mediatour* and *Redeemer*, it becomes *juſt*, *right*, and *equal*, that all the *good things* which are the *fruits* of his *death*, ſhould *be* in a *due and appointed ſeaſon* made out to them for whom he dyed, in their ſeveral generations.

What ſays *M. Baxter* to this? 1. *Suppoſe this be ſo, yet they are not actually abſolved, but only have a right to it*; Who ſaid *they* were? doe I offer to make any ſuch *concluſions*? doe I *diſpute againſt M. Baxter's* Poſition, or for juſtification *upon*, or *at* the death of Chriſt, or his undertaking? *homini homo quid intereſt?*

But I ſay, *there being* ſuch *a right* to theſe good things, *they* have a *right* to them. *Crimen inauditum* Caie *Cæſar!* Did I not alſo ſay how I *underſtood* that expreſſion? though I *uſed* it to make out the thing I intended, yet did I not ſay directly, that that

right was not *subjectively* in them : that is, that it was not *actionable* as *I* expressed it; that they *could not plead it*; but it was as above: Yea but then this is *no more* but *non injustum est*, this is *false* as *I* have *shewed*. Many Divines think, that this was the *estate* between *God* & *sinners antecedently* to the consideration of the death of Christ, or might have *been* without it, *viz.* that it was not *unjust* with God to *pardon* and *save them*; By the *death of Christ* there is a *jus* of *another nature* obtained; even *such* as I have described in the *Treatise M Baxter* opposeth : *But then God doth not give those good things to us upon condition*; I say he *doth not*; taking *Condition* in it's strict & *proper* sense in respect of God: Though he hath made *one thing* to be the Condition of *another*. All Graces are *alike absolutely purchased* for us; but not alike *absolutely received* by us: The *œconomy* of the *Gospel* requires another order; The *Frst grace*, *M. Baxter* confesseth is bestowed upon us *absolutely*, & without condition; & this *grace* is the *conditiõ* of the following *priviledges*, as to the order of cõmunicatiõ: & all the difference between us is about the sense of the word *condition* in that place. Which when I have *nothing* else to *doe*, I will *write* a Volume as *bigge* as this is about.

This is that I say; Christ hath *purchased all good things* for us: these things are *actually* to be conferred upon us in the *time* and *order* by God's Soveraigne will *determined* and disposed. This *order* as revealed in the Gospel, is, that we *believe* and be *justified*, &c. Faith whereby we *believe* is bestowed on us *absolutely*, alwaies without *condition*, sometimes without *outward meanes*; This faith by the *constitution* of God is attended with the priviledges *contended* about; which are *no less purchased* for us by Christ, then *faith* it selfe. Yea *the* purchase of our *justification* or *Acceptation* with God, is, in *order of Nature*, *antecedent* in Consideration to the *purchase* of faith for us: if *M. Baxter* hath a *mind* to oppose any thing of *this* (which is all that as yet to this businesse *I* have declared,) Let him doe it *when he pleaseth*, & if it be *tantidem* (*as he speaketh*) *I* shall give him a *further* account of my thoughts about it; But he would *know* what I meane by *Christ's undertaking for the Elect*; let him consider what *I* have *delivered* about the *Covenant* between the Father and Son in this business, and he will know at least what *I intend* thereby. He will *see* how Christ being then only *God*, did undertake the *businesse* to doe it, not *as God only*: and withal the *wideness* of that *exception*, that the *prophesy* of *Isaiah* was

written

written *a long time after, and could not give any such right as is pretended.* A right is given *there* in respect of *manifestation*, not *constitution. Isaiah* in that *prophesy speakes* of things *to come, as past*, v. 5. 6. and of things *past* and present, as to come; it *reveales*, not *constitutes* a *Covenant.* But he *saith, we use to distinguish betweene the undertaking and accomplishment: Divines use to say, that upon mans fall Christ undertooke satisfaction, but it was in the fullnesse of time that he accomplished it; how therefore he accomplished it in the undertaking*, I *do not well see.* 2. But *that he* did perfectly *accomplish what he undertooke I easily grant.* But! how you *learned Divines* distinguish I know not: This I know, that such *poore men as my selfe*, do beleive, that as to the *efficacy* of *satisfaction* and *merit*, Christs *undertaking* was attended with no less then his actuall accomplishment of what he undertooke; or we know not how to grant *Salvation* to the *Saints* under the *Old Testament*: It was concerning their *Efficacy* as to *merit*, not their *distinction* between themselves that I spake.

These things being *premised*, *M. B.* proceeds to answer my *Arguments*, which were *produced* to prove, that upon the *death of Christ*, there was a *right obtained* for the *Elect* to all the *benefits* of his death; this *right residing* in the *justice* of God, or in the *equalling* of these things by divine *constitution*, (as I fully declared in the *place* by *M. B.* opposed) upon the *interposing* of some expressions in the *processe* of my discourse, of the *grant* being made to the *elect*, and mentioning of *their right*, which in what sense they were to be taken, I expressly delared, *M. B.* takes advantage to *answer* them all with this intendment put upon them, that they aymed to prove a *subjective personall right*, which at any time they *may plead*, when the utmost that my words can be extended unto, is, that they have it *ex fœdere*, not *realiter*; for the *subject* of it, I *place* elsewhere. Now if *M. B.* will send *me word*, that he supposes he hath answered my *Arguments*, as they were *proposed* to my owne *purpose*, I will *promise* (if I live) to *returne* him an answer. In the meane time I shall have no itch to be *scribling* to no purpose; *ego me, tua causa, ne erres, non rupturus sum.* yet of the *whole* he may for the present be pleased to receive the ensuing *account*, both as to the nature of a *Jus*, and its *application.*

For the *description* of *jus*, *M. B.* rely's on *Grotius*, and something also he *mentions* out of *Sayrus*, *Grotius* in the first *chapter* of

of his booke *de jure belli & pacis*, in the *sections transcribed* (in part) by *M. B.* and some others, *expresses* (in his way) the *distinction* given at the beginning both of the *Institutions* & *Digests* about *jus*, and those also which they handle under the *head, de statu*. So do all men *commonly* that write of that subject; How *exactly* this is done by *Grotius*, those who are learned in the *Law* will judge; for *my part*, I am so farre at *liberty*, as not to be *concluded* by this bare *Affirmation* either as to *law* or *Gospell*; Yet neither doth he exclude the *Right* by me intended: He tels us indeed that *facultas* which the lawyers call *sui*, is that which *properly* and *strictly* he *intends* to call *jus*. But the other *member* of the *distinction* he termes *aptitudo*, which though in a *naturall* sense it respects the *subject* immediatly, yet he tels you, that in the sense of *Michael Ephesius*, which he contradicts not, it is but τὸ πρέπον, *id quod convenit*, which respects only the *order of things among thẽselves*. And though out of *Aristotle* he cals it also ἀξία, yet that *word* (as he also afterwards expounds it out of *Cicero*) is of much a *lower signification* then *many* imagine. This τὸ πρέπον, is that which I *assert*; and *Sayrus* his definition of *jus ad rem*, may also be allowed.

But for *others*; *jus, artificially* is, *ars boni & æqui*. Ponz: de Iamiis num: 14. Tom: 11. *jus Gregor*: p: 2. and D. D. cap. 1. Celsus. though some *dispute* against this *definition*, as *Conanus, Comment*: Jur: Civil: lib: 1. cap: 1. That which is *æquum* is the *subject* of it. so the *Comædian, quid cum illis agat, qui neque* jus, *neque* bonum, *neque æquum sciunt. Terent*: *Heauton*: *all termes* æquipollent. And in this *sense one* that is not *borne* may have *a jus*, if it be in a thing that is *profitable* to him; *quod dicimus eum qui nasci speratur pro superstite esse, tunc verum est, cum de ipsius jure quæritur, aliàs non prodest, nisi natus sit. Paulus de verbor: significat*: which one *interpretation* will overbeare with me an *hundred moderne* exceptioners, if they should deny that a man may be *said* to have *a right* unless he himselfe be the *immediate subject* of the *right*, as if it were a *naturall* accident *inherent* in him; so is it in the *case* proposed by *Cicero*, in *secundo* de inventione. *Pater-familias cum liberorum nihil haberet, uxorem autem haberet, in Testamento ita scripsit. Si mihi filius genitus fuerit unus, pluresve, hic mihi hæres esto.* The *father* dies before the *sonne* is *borne*: a right accrews to *him* that is not *borne*. Such a Right I say there is, although this Right is not immediatly *actionable*: *Gaius* tels us, that *actio* est prosecutio

tio juris sui. This *jus suum*, is that which *Grotius* cals *facultas*, and is *jus propriè & strictè dictum.* And this *jus suum* I did not intend, in that I said it was *nôt actionable*; And therefore whereas *Conanus* saies, that *nullum est jus, cui non sit aut à natura, aut à lege data quædam obligatio, tanquam comes & adjutrix*: Comment: juris Civil: lib: 2. cap: 1. which *obligation* is the foundation of *Action*; It is evident, that he intends *jus propriè & strictè dictum*; for *Gaius* distinguisheth between *jus utendi, fruendi*, and *jus obligationis*, D. li: 1. l. 8. which he *could not do*, if *all* and every right had an *Obligation* attending it, And such is that Right whereof we speake; If any one thinkes to *plead* it, he will be like him, whom the *Lawyers call, agentem sine actione*, of whom they dispute, an *liceat ei experiri*, and whether his *plea* be to be admitted; concerning which the variety of *cases* and *opinions* are *repeated* by *Menochius* de Arbit: Judic: lib: 1. Qu: 16. 2.

And such a *jus* as this, ariseth *ex contractis innominatis*; for as *jus ex innominato contractu oritur, quum ex parte debentis, implere id quod convenerat, impletum est*, Ludovic: Roman: Consul: 86. pag: 23. so *ex contractu innominato, non transeunt actiones sine mandato*, as *Bartholus* tels us; For though the *Covenant* between *Father* and *Sonne*, whence this *Right ariseth*, be not in it selfe of the nature of a *contractus innominatus, do ut des*, yet to them it is of that import. Hence the *Socinians*, who are *skil'd* in the *Law*, though they wholly *suspend* the *actuall* obtaining of Remission of sinnes upon the fulfilling of the *conditions* required, do yet grant, that a *plenary jus* or *right* of *obtaining forgivenesse* of sinnes was given to all in the death of Christ; *jam vero quidnam mediator fœderis, ab una paciscentium parte legatus, & ipsius sponsor constitutus, ac quoddam veluti testamentum ejus nomine constituens, qua talis est, aliud præstat, quam ut jus alteri parti, & jus quidem plenum largiatur, ad fœderis hujus, aut testamenti promissa consequenda; obstringit nimirùm atque obligat promissorem qui ipsum obligaverat ad servanda fœderum promissa, eáque rata prorsus habenda. Crellius de causis mortis Christi*, pag: 9. So in the common speach of the *Antients Budæus* tels us, that *bonum jus dicere*, is as much as that which is now *vulgarly* expressed, *requesta tua rationabilis est*: If there be an *equity* in the *thing*, there is a *jus* belonging to the person. Any thing that made it *equitable* that a man should be *regarded*, they called his *jus*: whence is his com-

plaint in *Plautus*, finding himselfe every way *unworthy*: *sine modo & modestiâ suâ, sine bono jure, atque honore*: Bachid: and *Paulus*, in lib. 3. ff. de servitut: urb: præd: *Nejus sit vicino invitis nobis altiùs ædificare*.. It were very facile both from *Lawyers* and most *approved Authours* to multiply instances of this large *Acceptation* of the word *jus*, or *right*. And whither the *grant* of the *father*, and *purchase* of the *mediator* before *mentioned*, be not sufficient to constitute or *denominate* such a *jus* or *right* in them, for *whom*, and *whose profit* and benefit the *grant* is made, I question not. Againe consider that of *Paulus*. lib: 11. ad, Edict: D D. de verb. signif: Tit: 16. *Princeps bona concedendo, videtur etiam obligationem concedere*; which adds a *propriety* to the *jus* as was *shewed* before. Yet that it should be presently *actionable* doth not follow: *Actio est jus persequendi in judicio, quod sibi debetur*; *Institut: lib*: 4. *de action*. Every *jus ad rem*, is not *jus persequendi in judicio*: whence is the gloss of *Aldobrondinus* on that place: *nec facias magnam vim ibi: Quia cum multas habeat significationes hæc dictio jus*, ut ff. de inst: *& jus l: p. &, si, hoc est unum de significatis ejus, ut dicatur jus agendi vel persequendi*: besides it must be, *quod sibi debetur*, that is *actionable*; the obligation whence that *debitum* arises, being as the *Lawyers* speak, *mater actionis*; But yet even, *debere*, it selfe, is of so *larg* and *various* signification in the *Law*, both in respect to *things*, and *persons*, as will not admit of any *determinate sense* unless otherwise restrained, *ff: de verbor: signif. b. pecuniæ* §. 8. *si*. Yea and on the *other side*, *sometimes* a *plea* may *lye*, where there is no *debitum*; *Quandoque ago etiam ad id quod mihi non debetur*; R. de pact: l. *si pacto quo pœnam; nam ibi non ago ad id quod est debitum, sed ad id quod ex nudo pacto convenit*: that *M. B.* may know what to do with his *schemes* of *Actions*, produced on the account of my *assertions*.

This for the *word*, and my use of it; I hope in the *things* of God, about *words*, I shall not much contend. I had rather indeed insist on the *propriety* of words, in the *originals*, their *use* in the *Law*, and amongst men, so all be regulated by the *Analogy* of faith, then to *square* the things of *God* to the *termes* and *Rules* of *Art* and *Philosophy*, to which without doubt they will not Answer. Let any man living expres any *Doctrine* of the *Gospell* whatever, in the *exactest* manner, with *Artificial Philosophicall* termes, and *I* will undertake to shew, that in many things the truth is wrested and *fettered* thereby, and will not beare an *exact*

correſpondence with them; yet hence are many of our Learned *ſtrifes*, which as they have *little* of *learning* in them, ſo for my part I value them not at a *nutſhell* ! *properly* ſo called.

This being *premiſ'd*, his Anſwers to my Arguments may very *breifly* be conſider'd.

My firſt Argument is. It is *juſtum*, *that they ſhould have the fruites of the death of Chriſt beſtowed on them: therefore they have* jus *unto them: for*, jus eſt quod juſtum eſt.

M. B. denyes the *conſequence*, and ſaies though it be *juſtum*, *yet they may not be ſubjects of this jus*; to this I have *anſwered*, by ſhewing what is *jus* in Generall, & *what* is their *jus*, & *where* fixed.

2. He Queſtions the *Antecedent*; for the confirmation whereof, and its vindication from his *exceptions*, I referre the Reader to what I *had written* of the *Covenant*, between the father and the ſonne, ſome *good while* before I *ſaw* M. Bax. Animadverſions, or that they were publicke.

My 2d. is, *that which is procur'd for any one, thereunto he hath a Right*; *The thing that is obtained, is granted by him, of whom it is obtained, and that to them, for whom it is obtained.* To this is anſwered.

1. In the *margent*; *that I ſhould make great changes in England, If I could make all the Lawyers believe this ſtrange doctrine*: but of *what* the *Lawyers believe*, or do not *believe*, M. B. is no *competent judg*, be it ſpoken without *diſparagment*, for the *Law* is not his *ſtudy*. I, who (perhaps) have much *leſſe skill then himſelfe*, will be bound at any time to give him *twenty caſes*, out of the *Civill* and *Canon Law*, to make good *this Aſſertion*; which if he *knowes not*, that it may be done, he *ought not to ſpeake* with ſuch *confidence* of theſe things. Nay amongſt our owne *lawyers* (whom perhaps he intends) I am ſure he may be *informed*, that if a man *intercede* with another to *ſettle* his *land* by *Conveyance* to a *third* perſon, giving him that *conveyance* to keep in truſt, untill the *time* come, that he ſhould by the *intention* of the *conveyer* enjoy the Land, though he for *whom it is granted*, have not the leaſt *knowledg* of it, yet he hath *ſuch a right* unto the land thereby created, as cannot be *diſanul'd*.

But 2. he ſaies! *that the fruits of the death of Chriſt, are procur'd for us*, finaliter *not* ſubjectivè.

Anſ. They are procur'd for us *objectivè*, are granted, *ex ad*

æquatione rerum, and may make us *subjects* of the *right*, though not of the *things themselves*, which it regards; may I say, though I *do not* say it doth. The following similitudes of *my horse, and a King*, have no *correspondency* with this business at all; of the *Right of horses*, there is nothing in the *Law*: in the *latter*, there is *nothing* omitted in the *comparison*, but *merit*, and *purchase*, which is *all*.

3. All the *fruites of the death of Christ are obtained and procur'd by his merit for them for whom he dyed.*

M. B. 1. *not all, not the same measure of sanctification for one as for another: not faith for all, for whom he dyed, as for his Elect.*

2. *He procur'd it for us as the* finis cui, *not* subjects *of the present Right.*

Ans. The *substance* of the *fruits* of the death of Christ, and the *ultimate end*, belongs to his *purchase*: the *measure* and *degrees* of *them* to the fathers *soveraigne* dispo sall, *ad ornatum universi.*

2. It is *most false*, that Christ did not purchase *faith for all*, for whom he dyed.

3. What our *Right* is, hath been before delivered; the *finis cui*, & subject of a present Right, are not very accurately opposed.

4. *The nature of merit infers an attendant Right:* Rom: 4. 4.

M. B. *If this be your debt, you may say, Lord I have merited salvation in Christ, therefore it is mine of debt; Christ hath of debt the right to pardon you, you have no debt, &c.*

Ans. Very good! but I use *no formes of prayer of other mens composing*; who said, it was *our debt?* who saies our right is actionble? The whole here intended, is, that Christ meriting *pardon* of sinnes for the *Elect*, it is *just* they should obtaine it in the *appointed* season: such another *prayer* as that here mentioned, doth *M. B.* afterwards *compose* in a *suitablenesse* as he *supposes* to my *principles*; but *what* may he not *do*, or *say?*

4. *He for whom a Ransome is paid, hath a right to his liberty by vertue of that payment.*

M. B. *All unproved, and by me unbelieved; if you pay a summe to the Turke for a thousand slaves, thereby buying them absolutly into your owne power, I do not believe that they have any more right to freedome, then they had before. If a Prince pay a ransome for some traytors to the King his father, thereby purchasing to himselfe a dominion or a propriety over them, so that they are absolutly his, yet I thinke*

thinke it gives them no more right then they had before.

Anſ. I ſuppoſe it is not *yet determined*, that this buſineſs is to be *regulated abſolutly* according to what M. B. *thinkes* or *believes*. For I muſt needs ſay, that whether he *believes it* or *no*, I am ſtill of the *ſame minde* that I was.

He *for whom a Ranſome* is paid, hath a Right to a deliverance; as to him, to whom the *Ranſome* was paid: if *M. B.* believes not this, let him conſult the *Civill Lawyers*, with whom he is ſo *converſant*: Tit: de pact:

2. I ſay, that the *Law* of *Redemption* requir's, that the *Redeemed* be at the diſpoſall of the Redeemer, where he hath no *plea jure poſtliminii*; and it is moſt certaine, that Chriſt hath a *dominion* over his *Elect*; (for a propriety over them I underſtand not) yet, that that *dominion* is the *proximate end* of the Death of Chriſt, under the *notion* of a *Ranſome*, *price*, or *purchaſe* (which yet are of various conſiderations alſo,) is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος of this diſcourſe.

Having given this *ſpecimen* of *M. B's. anſwers* to my inſtances, as an addition to the former Explication given of my judgment in this buſineſs, I ſhall not further trouble the Reader with the conſideration of what of that ſame kind enſues.

To *tell* the whole *truth*, I expreſſed the *effects* of the death of Chriſt, in the mãner above *mẽtioned*, to *obviate* that *ſtating* of his *ſatisfactiõ* & the *uſe* of it, which I had obſerved to be *inſiſted* on by the *Remonſtrants* in their *Apology*, and in other *writings* of theirs, but eſpecially by *Epiſcopius*. For *ſome time*, I met not with any *great oppoſition* made to the expreſſions of their *imaginations* in this buſineſs, but only what was briefly remarked by the *Leyden profeſſors* in their *ſpecimina*. Of late I find *Voetius* reckoning it among the *principall controverſies*, that we have with the enemies *of the croſſe of* Chriſt: I ſhall ſet downe his *words* about it, and leave them to the conſideration of them who may thinke themſelves concerned in them.

His words in his diſputation *de merito Chriſti*, An. 1650. are: *Secunda controverſia capitalis, quæ Chriſtianiſmo cum quibuſdam heterodoxis* (Remonſtrantibus *ſcilicet in Belgio, viris, ſi non Socinianæ, ſaltem dubiæ Theologiæ*) *intercedit, eſt de merito Chriſti pro nobis, hoc eſt, vice, & loco noſtro, & ſic in bonum noſtrum actualiter præſtito, ſeu de ſatisfactione plenâ ac propriè dictâ à Chriſto ſponſore, loco noſtro juſtitiæ divinæ præſtitâ: illi ſatisfactionem & meritum ſic*

accipiunt, quasi nihil aliud sit, quam partis offensæ talis placatio qua offenso hactenùs satisfit, ut in gratiam redire velit cum eo qui offendit, & per quam Christus Deo Patri jus & voluntatem aquisiverit novum fœdus ineundi cum hominibus. so he.

The expression of our *dying with Christ* is fallen upon againe, *p.*226. of which he desires leave to speak as *confidently as myselfe*; truly I thought he had not *been to aske leave* for that now: But why may he not *use* it without *leave* as well as *others*? Some perperhaps wil say, *mira edepol sunt ni hic in ventrem, sumpsit confidentiam*, to consider what he hath written already. But with this leave he fals a *conjecturing* at what *I* meane by that *expression*, to no *purpose* at all, as may be seen by what I have delivered concerning it. The like I may say to the *passage* by the way mentioned, of the right *which ariseth from the decree of God*: It seemes to *me*, that what God hath *decreed* to doe for any, that *is*, or may be a *real priviledge* to him, it is *jus, ex justitia condecentiæ*, that in the *appointed* season, he should *receive it*. If *M. Baxter*, be otherwise minded I *cannot help* it; *habeo aliquid magis ex memet, & majus*, then that I should attend to the *disputes* thereabout; nor will I stand in his way if I can choose, for he seemes to cry——*ad terram dabo, & dentilegos omnes mortales faciam quemq; offendero.*

After this *I* find not my *selfe* particularly smitten, until he *comes* to the close of the chapter to *talke* of *idem* and *tantidem*: Unless it be in his *passage* pag. 274. That which makes me *suspect* that *I* am there *intended*, is, his former *imputation* of some *such* thing unto me; namely that *I* should *say*, that *the deputation of Christ in our stead, is an act of pardon*; But *I* suppose that *I* have so fully *satisfied* him as to that surmize, by *shewing* that not only *my sense*, but my *exrressions* were, not, that the *deputation* of Christ, was *our pardon*, but that the *freedome of pardon* did in *part* depend thereon, that *I* will not *take* my selfe in this place to be *concerned*; because *I* cannot doe it and prevent the returnal of a *charge* of some *negligence* on *this Person*, whose *writings* seem sufficiently to *free* him from all just *suspicion* thereof. *In* the close of *this discourse* (with the *method* of a new *line*) *M. Baxter* fals upon the consideration of the *payment* made by Christ in our steed, or the *penalty* that he underwent for us; and *pleads*, that it was not the *idem* that was due to us, but *tantundem*. Although *some* say this *difference is not tantidem*, (as some speake it seemes) yet he is resolved

resolved of the *contrary*, and that this one *Assertion* is the bottome of all *Antinomianisme*. Seing *I* professe my selfe to be *contrary minded*, *I* suppose it will be *expected* that *I* should *consider* what is here to the purpose in hand *insisted* on by *M. B.* What *I* intend by *paying* the *idem*, or rather *undergoing* the *idem* that we should have done, *I* have so fully *elsewhere* expressed; that I shall not *stay* the Reader with the repetition of it. But sayes *M. Baxter* this *subvertes the substance of Religion*: ἰδὲ ῥοδὸς, ἰδὲ πήδημα. Now you shall have the proofes of it, the *idem* (sayth he) is the *perfect obedience*, *or the full punishment of the man himselfe*, *and in case of personal disobedience, it is personal punishment that the Law requires*, that is, *suplicium ipsius delinquentis.*

A. But: The *idem* that we would *pay*, or *undergoe*, is *perfect* obedience to the *Law*, and proportionable *punishment* by the God's *Constitution*, for *disobedience*; This Christ *payed*, and *underwent*; that the *man himselfe* should undergoe it, is the Law *originally*; but the undergoing or doing of it, by another, is the *undergoing* of the *idem*, I think; it is personal punishment that the Law *originally* requires; but he that uudergoes the *punishment* (though he be not *personally* disobedient,) which the Law *judgeth* to him that was *personally* disobedient, undergoes the *idem* that the *Law requires.*

The *idem* is *supplicïam delinquenti debitum*, by whoever it be *undergone*, not *supplicium ipsius delinquentis* only.

He proceeds: *the Law never threatned a surety, nor granteth any liberty of substitution: that was an act of God above the Law; therefore Christ did not undergoe the* idem. I deny the *consequence.* Nor is the least *shadow* of proof made of it: The question is not whether Christ be *the sinner*, but whether he *underwent* that which was due to the *sinner.*

He addes. If *therefore the thing due Was payd it was we our selves morally or legally, that suffered*: I know not well what is *meant by morrally*; but *however* I deny the *consequence*; the thing it *selfe Was payd* by *another* for us, and the *punishment it selfe* was undergone by another, in our stead.

That which *followes*, fals with that which went *before*, being built thereon. It *could not be our selves Legally* (saith he) *because it Was not our selves naturally.* Though for the security of the *Hypothesis* opposed, there is no *need* of it, yet I deny his *proposition*, also

alſo, is taken *univerſally*. A man may be accounted to doe a thing *Legally* by a *ſponſor*, though he doe it not in his own Perſon.

But he ſays, *if it had been our ſelves Legally, the ſtricteſt juſtice could not have denyed us a preſent deliverance* ipſo facto, *being no juſtice can demand any more then the* idem quod debitur. (as *M. Baxter's Printer* ſpeakes) But 1: it is *ſuppoſed*, that all *Legal performance* of any thing, by any one, muſt be done in his own *Perſon*.

2. It *ſuppoſes*, that there is ſuch an *end* as deliverance aſſigned, or *aſſignable*, to the *offenders* own undergoing of the *penalty*, which is falſe.

3. The Reaſons and Righteouſneſs of our actual *deliverance* at the *time*, and in the manner preſcribed by *God*, and (as to the *laſt*) revealed in the *Goſpel*, upon Chriſt's performance of *perſonal* obedience, and *undergoing* the *penalty* due to us in our *ſtead*; which are founded in the *œconomy of the Trinity*, voluntarily ingaged into for the *accompliſhing* the ſalvation of the *Elect*, I have elſewhere touched on, and may, if I *find* it neceſſary, hereafter handle at large.

That which is feared in this buſineſs is, that if the *idem* be payd, then according to the *Law*, the *Obligation* is *diſſolved*, and preſent deliverance followes. But if by the *Law*, be meant the *Civil Law*, whence theſe termes are *borrowed*, it is moſt certain, that *any thing* in *ſtead* of that which is in the Obligation doth according to the *Rules* of the Law diſſolve the *Obligation*, and that whether it be payd by the *principal debtour*, or Delinquent, or *any* for him; The beginning of that *Section*, quibus modis tollitur obligatio, *lib.* 3. *Inſtit* : will evince this ſufficiently. The *Title* of the *Section* is, Si ſolvitur ID quod debetur, vel ALIUD loco illius, conſentiente creditore, *omnis ſolvitur Obligatio*, tum *rei* principalis, quam fide-juſſoris. The words of the *Law* it ſelfe are more full. Tollitur autem omnis obligatio ſolutione EJUS quod debetur; vel ſiquis conſentiente creditore ALIUD pro ALIO ſolverit; nec intereſt *quis* ſolverit, utrum IPSE qui debet, an ALIUS pro eo: liberatur enim & *alio* ſolvente, ſive ſciente, ſive ignorante debitore, vel invito, eo ſolutio fiat: Si fide-juſſor ſolverit, non enim ipſe *ſolus* liberatur, ſed *reus*. So that there is no difference in the Law, whether *ſolutio* be *ejuſdem* or *tantidem*; and this is the caſe in the things that are *ex maleficio, aut quaſi*; as may be ſeen at large in the *Commentatours* on that place.

To caution all *men* against the *poyson* of Antimonian *Doctrines*, now so *strenuously* opposed by *Mr. Baxter*, and to deliver *students* from the unhappy *model* of *Theologie*, which the men of the *preceding contests* have entangled *themselves*, and *others* withal, *M B.* seriously advises them to keep in their *minds, and carefully to distinguish between the Will of God's purpose, and his precepts or Law*, his *determining*, and *commanding will*, in the first place; *the ignorance* whereof it seemes, confounded the *Theologie* of Doctour *Twisse*, *Pemble*, and others.

Nextly, that they would carefully distinguish between the covenant between the Father and the Son about the Work of his mediation, & the covenant of Grace and mercy confirmed to the Elect in his blood.

Now if these two *Distinctions*, as *carefully* heeded, and as *warily* observed as we are *able*, will prove such an *antidote* against the *infection*, for *my part* (in all *probability*) I shall be *secure*, having owned them ever since I learned my *Catechisme*.

Καὶ ταῦτα μὲ δὲ ταῦτα.

And so am I dismissed. This may perhaps be the close of this *controversy*; if *otherwise*, I am *indifferent*; on the *one* side it *will* be so: *I* delight not in these *troubled waters*. If I must *engage* againe in the *like* kind, I shall *pray*, that he, from whom are all my *supplyes*, would give me a *real humble frame* of heart, that I may have no need with many *pretences*, and a multitude of *good words*, to make a *cloak* for a spirit breaking *frequently* through all with *sad discoveryes* of *pride* and *passion*; and to keep me from all *magisterial insolence*, *Pharisaical* supercilious *selfe-conceitednesse*, *contempt* of others, and every thing that is contrary to the *Rule* whereby I ought to walke.

If men be in *hast* to *oppose* what I have *delivered* about this businesse, let them (if they please, I have no Authority to prescribe them *their way*) speak *directly* to the purpose, and oppose that which is *affirmed*, and answer my *reasons* in reference to that *End* only for which by me they are *produced* and insisted on:

Because I *see* some men have a *desire* to be *dealing* with me, and yet know not *well* what to *fix upon*, that I may deliver them from the vanity of contending with their own *surmizes*, and if it be *possible*, to prevaile with them *to speak closely, clearly, and distinctly* to the matter of their *contests*, & not mixe *heterogeneous* things in the *same* discourse, I will briefly *shrive* my selfe for their satisfaction.

First then I doe not *believe* that any man is *actually justified* from *eternity*; because of that of the Apostle Rom. 8. 28, 29, 30: but yet what is the *state* of things, in reference to the *œconomy* of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, engaged in from *Eternity* for the salvation of *sinners*, with that *fountaine union*, that is between *Christ* and his *body* in their *predestination*, I shall desire a *little more time* to deliver my selfe unto.

2 I doe *believe* that there was a *Covenant*, *compact*, or *Agreement* between father and *Son* for the salvation of the *Elect* by his *mediation*, which, upon *sinnes* entring into the *world*, had an *efficacy* & *effect* of the very same *nature* with that, which it hath when he hath *actually* accomplished what was on his part *required* for the end *proposed* to him; & that *therefore* in *the old Testament* his death is spoken of sometimes as *past*, *Isa.* 53. 4, 5, 6: & that to make this *Covenant* in it's *Constitution* to be contemporary to it's *revelation*, or the *promises* of it to be then made to *Christ*, when the Church is *acquainted* that those *promises* are made, is a wide mistake.

But under what consideration the *Elect* lye unto God, upon the transaction of this original *Covenant* with the *Mediatour*, *I* desire *liberty* for a while as above.

3 *I* doe not believe that the *Elect*, that live *after* the death of Christ, are all *actually* in their own *Persons justified* and *absolved* at his *death*; because *the Wrath of God abides on men that believe not*, Joh. 3. 36. But yet what to the *advantage* of the Church is enwrapped in the *discharge* of their great *representative*, who dyed in their stead (for that *I* believe also, and not only for their *good*) *I* desire respite for my thoughts as *formerly*.

4. *I* doe *believe* that Christ underwent the *very same punishment* for us, for the *nature* and *kind* of it, which we were obnoxious unto, & should have *undergone*, had not he *undertaken* for us, and payd the *idem* that we should have done, 2 Cor. 5. 12. Gal. 3. 13.

5. *I* believe that upon the *death of Christ*, considering what hath been sayd before concerning the *compact*, and *Agreement between* God and the *Mediatour*, about that matter; it became *just* and *righteous*, with reference to God's *justice*, as *Supreme Governour* and moderatour of the creatures, and all their *Concernements*, that *those* for whom he *dyed*, should all be made *partakers* of all the *good* things, which Christ by his *death* procured for them, in the *season* appointed

appointed by the soveraigne will of *God*. But that this right though *indissoluble* is so *actually* vested in them, as to be *actionable* in the *Gospel* without *faith*, I believe not.

6. *I* believe that all *spiritual* blessings, *mercyes*, *priviledges* whatever, are *fruites* of the *death* of Christ, and that notwithstanding the *order* wherein they *stand* one to another, they all depend immediately on it's causality; though *respectu termini* they have not a natural *immediation*.

7. *I professe* that we are *absolved*, *pardoned*, and *justified* for Christ's sake, & therefore that Christ is *reckoned* to *us*, or *made righteousnesse* to *us*, in order of nature *antecedently* to all those things, which for his sake we doe receive, and are made *partakers of* with and by him, &c.

For a *close* of all, *I* must profess, that *I* will not contend with any man, who discovers in *himselfe* such a resolution θέσιν διαφυλάξειν, that if he be *pressed*, rather then let it *go*, he will goe *backward*, and attempt ἀκίνητα κινεῖν, and to Question *common* received *principles*; knowing the *multitude* of Errours, and *Abominations* that the *Church* of God hath been pestered *withal* by men of this principle and *practise*. Hence are the *beginnings* of men modest, but their *Endings* desperate: hence is *Arminianisme* ended in *Episcopianisme*; and *Arianisme* in *Socinianisme*, & in many, *Socinianisme* in *Mahumedisme* and *Atheisme*. *If I* find this *resolution* and *spirit* in any man, he shall rather enjoy his own *present conceits*, then by me be *precipitated* into worse Abominations. Nor shall *I* (the Lord assisting) be *unmindful* of that of the *Apostle*, 1 Tim. 6. 3, 4, 5. εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ, καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ τετύφωται, μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημίαι, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραὶ, παραδιατριβαὶ, &c. as also *that* of the same Apostle, *Tit.* 3. 2. μηδένα βλασφημεῖν, ἀμάχους εἶναι, ἐπιεικεῖς, πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους πραΰτητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. *If I* must contend with any, as *I* am resolved for the *matter* περὶ τιμῆς τοῦ ἀληθείας, so for the *manner* of handling it, it shall not be my *endeavour* to cloud and *darken* things easy, *trite*, *common* in themselves, with *new*, *dark*, *artificial* expressions, but rather to give *plainenesse* and *perspicuity* to things *hard* and *difficult*, *confirming them* with the *Authority* of Scripture, *opened* by the *import* of the words insisted on, and *designe* of the Holy Ghost in

their *contexture*; Nor will I contend with any, whose *motto* is that of him in *Plautus*; *dicat quod quisq; vult, ego de hac sententia non dimovebor*: or that hath thoughts of his own *notions*, like those of him in *Navius*, who cryed out, *primum quod dicebo recte, secundum quod dicebo eo melius.* And as my *ayme* is to *know Christ, and him crucified*, to *exalt* him, and *ascribe* to him the *preheminence* in all things, to *discover* the *whole* of our salvation, and *glory* of God thereby, *centred* in his *Person* and *mediation*, with it's *emanation* from thence, through the *efficacy* of the *eternal Spirit*, and all our *obedience* to receive *life*, *power*, and *vigour* from thence only, knowing that it is the *obedience* of faith, and hath it's foundation in *blood and water*; so I equally abhorre all *doctrines* that would take selfe out of the dust, make *something* of that which is worse then *nothing*, and *spin* out *matter* for a *web* of *peace* and *consolation* from our own *bowels*, by resolving our *Acceptation* with God into any thing *in our selves*; and *those*, that by any meanes would intercept the *Efficacy* of the *death* and *Crosse* of Christ from it's worke of *perpetual* and constant *mortification* in the hearts of Believers; or cut off any *obligation* unto *obedience* or *holinesse*, that by the *discovery* of the *will* of *God*, either in the *Law*, or *Gospel*, is put upon the Redeemed ones of the Lord.

Τὰς δὲ μωρὰς καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους ζητήσεις παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι γεννῶσι μάχας; 2 *Tim.* 2. 23.

FINIS